

17
LETTER ,

OF

MR. WALKER, OF MISSISSIPPI,

RELATIVE TO THE

REANNEXATION OF TEXAS:

IN REPLY TO

THE CALL OF THE PEOPLE OF CARROLL COUNTY, KENTUCKY,

TO

COMMUNICATE HIS VIEWS ON THAT SUBJECT.

PHILADELPHIA:

PRINTED BY MIFFLIN AND PARKY,

AT THE

OFFICE OF THE PENNSYLVANIAN.

No. 39 South Second Street.

1844

LETTER.

WASHINGTON CITY, Jan. 8, 1844.

GENTLEMEN:—Your letter, dated Ghent, Carroll County, Kentucky, November 25th, 1843, has been received. It contains the resolutions of a meeting of the people of that county, in favour of the annexation of Texas, and requesting the candidates for the presidency and vice-presidency of the Union to make "known to (you) or to the public," their views on this subject. As a committee, you have transmitted me these proceedings, together with a special letter addressed to me as a candidate for the "vice-presidency," requesting my opinions on this question. I am not a candidate for the vice-presidency. The only State in which my name has been designated, to any considerable extent, for this station, was my own; and knowing how many, with much older and better claims than mine, were named for this office, for this and other reasons, by letter, dated Nov. 20, 1843, addressed by me to the democratic convention which assembles this day in Mississippi, my name is withdrawn unconditionally.

The treaty by which Texas was surrendered to Spain, was always opposed by me; and in 1826, 1834, and 1835, various addresses were made by me, and then published, in favour of the reannexation of Texas; and the same opinions have been often expressed by me since my election, in 1836, to the Senate of the Union.

It was a revolution in Mexico that produced the conflict for independence in Texas. The citizens of Texas had been invited there by Mexico, under the solemn guaranty of the federal constitution of 1824. This constitution, to which Texas so long and faithfully adhered, was prostrated by the usurper Santa Anna. After a severe struggle, the people of Mexico were subdued by a mercenary army; the States were annihilated, and a military dictator was placed at the head of a central despotism. In the capital of Mexico, and of the state of Coahuila and Texas, the civil authorities were suppressed by the bayonet; the disarming of every citizen was decreed, and the soldiery of the usurper proceeded to enforce this edict. The people of Texas resolved to resist, and perish upon the field of battle, rather than submit to the despotic sway of a treacherous and sanguinary military dictator. Short was the conflict, and glorious the issue. The American race was successful; the armies of the tyrant were overthrown and dispersed, and the dictator himself was captured. He was released by Texas, and restored to his country, having first acknowledged, by a solemn treaty, the independence of Texas. After the fall of Santa Anna, and the total route and dispersion of the Mexican army, and when a resubjugation had become hopeless, I introduced into the Senate, the resolution acknowledging the independence of Texas. It was adopted in March, 1837, and the name of Texas inscribed on the roll of independent nations. Subsequently, France, England, and Holland, have recognised her independence; and Texas now has all the rights of sovereignty over her territory and people, as full and perfect as any other nation of the world. It was to Spain, and not to Mexico, that we transferred Texas by treaty; and it was by a revolution in Mexico, and the recognition of her independence, not by Spain, but by this republic and other

nations, that Mexico acquired any title to Texas. It was by a successful revolution, and the expulsion of Spanish power, that Mexico, unrecognised by Spain, acquired all her right to this territory; and it is by a similar successful revolution that Texas has obtained the same territory. These principles have been recognised for many years by Mexico, and by this republic; and it is absurd in Mexico now to attempt to recall her unequivocal assent to these doctrines, and ask to be permitted to change the well-settled law of nations, and oppose the reannexation of Texas. It is an admitted principle of the law of nations, that every sovereignty may cede the whole or any part of their territory, unless restrained by some constitutional interdict; and which, if it exist, may be removed by the same sovereign power which imposed the limitation. There is, however, no such limitation in the constitution of Texas, which is a single central government, with the same authority to make the cession, as appertained to France or Spain, in the transfer of Louisiana or Florida. Nor does it change the question of power, that these were distant colonies; for the sovereignty extends alike over every portion of the nation: and this principle was fully recognised when Mr. Adams, as President, and Mr. Clay, as Secretary of State, in 1825 and 1827, by instructions to our minister at Mexico; and General Jackson, as President, and Mr. Van Buren, as Secretary of State, by subsequent similar instructions in 1829, endeavoured to procure from Mexico the cession of Texas, then a contiguous and integral portion of the Mexican confederacy. And if a nation may cede a portion of her territory, being completely sovereign over the whole, she may certainly cede the whole; and, in any event, this would be a question, not of our right to receive, but of the authority of the ceding nation to make the transfer, or simply, an inquiry whether we obtained a good or a bad title. In this case, the title would be unquestionable; for Texas being independent in fact, and so recognised by ourselves, and the great powers of Europe, as completely sovereign throughout her territory, Mexico could make no just objection to the transfer.

In 1836, this question, together with that of ratifying their constitution, was submitted by the constituted authorities to the people of Texas, who, with unparalleled unanimity, (there being but ninety-three dissenting votes,) decided in favour of reannexation.

Texas, then, has already assented to the reannexation, not merely by the act of all her authorities, but of her people, and made it a part and parcel of the organization of the government itself; and he who, with the knowledge of these facts, would now deny the power of Texas to assent to the reannexation, must reject and discard the great fundamental principle of popular sovereignty. Surely, then, no one will contend that monarchies may transfer, and we receive, their colonies and subjects, without and against their consent; but that the entire people of a single republic, in whom resides the only rightful sovereignty, cannot cede, nor we receive, their own territory, and that monarchs have more power than the people, and are more truly sovereign. Texas, then, having the undoubted right to transfer

the whole or any part of the territory, there can be no difference, as a *question of constitutional power*, between our right to receive a part or the whole of the territory.

The reannexation, then, can be accomplished by any one of three modes. 1st, by treaty; 2d, by an act of Congress, without a treaty; and 3d, by the authority reserved to each State, to extend their boundaries, and annex additional territory with the sanction of Congress.

1st. By treaty.—This right was established in the cession of Louisiana and Florida, and cannot now be questioned without menacing the organization of the government and integrity of the Union; for, by virtue of this power, three States and several Territories now compose a part of the republic. In 1642, we acquired territory by treaty, and attached it to the States of New York and Vermont. There was there no disputed boundary, for the call was for a certain parallel of latitude—a mere question of measurement—which, when made, placed this territory within the undoubted limits of Canada; in consequence of which, we had abandoned the fortress erecting at Rouse's Point, and the ground it occupied, (which was a part of this territory,) which we acquired by the treaty of 1642. The question of the power of annexation by treaty is settled, and incorporated into the very existence of the government and of the Union.

2d. The object may be accomplished by act of Congress without a treaty.—The language of the constitution is:—"New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the legislatures of the States concerned, as well as of the Congress." The grant is unlimited, except that the boundary of an existing State cannot be disturbed by Congress without the assent of the State legislatures. "New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union." This is the broad language of the constitution; and to confine it to territory then acquired, is to interpolate most important words into that instrument. Nor could it have been the intention of the framers of the constitution to prevent the acquisition of new territory. Louisiana was not then a part of the Union, but it was a most important part of the valley of the Mississippi, containing New Orleans, and the whole of the western, and the most essential part of the eastern portion of that territory, with both banks of its great river for many hundred miles above its mouth, and the only outlet of the products of the mighty valley, starting at the Youghiogany in Maryland, and the Alleghany in New York, uniting at Pittsburg, where they form the Ohio, to the outlet of all into the Gulf. If we look at the condition of many of the States when the constitution was framed, we will find it could never have been adopted had it forbidden the acquisition of the only outlet of all the products of the West. The waters of western Maryland, and of western New York, commingle with those of the Ohio and Mississippi. There stood Pittsburg at the head of the Ohio; and one-third of Pennsylvania is intersected by streams which water a part of the great valley. Virginia then included Kentucky; three-fourths of her territory was within the great valley, and the Ohio and Mississippi itself were its boundary for more than a thousand miles. North

Carolina then included Tennessee, and was bounded for hundreds of miles by the river Mississippi; and Georgia then embraced Alabama and Mississippi, and was not only bounded for several hundred miles by the great river, but advanced to within a few miles of the city of New Orleans. Is it possible that all these States, in forming the constitution, could have intended to prohibit forever the acquisition of the mouth of the Mississippi, then in the hands of a hostile and despotic foreign power? The constitution contains no such suicidal provision; and all the historical facts, both before and after its adoption, are against any such anti-American restriction. As to a treaty, it is only necessary as indicating the assent of the ceding nation; and if that has been given already, as in the case of Texas, without a treaty, our acceptance may be made by Congress. Suppose the constitution of Texas forbid the cession, except by Congress: when their Congress passed the assenting law, could not we accept, by act of Congress? Or suppose Texas, or any other contiguous territory, was vacant and unclaimed by any power, could we not annex it by act of Congress? One of the grounds assumed in Congress, and by our government, in defence of our title to Oregon, is its alleged discovery and occupancy by us, (long before the treaty with France,) being one of the acknowledged modes by which nations acquire territory; but if we can only acquire territory by treaty, then this ground, upon which we claim title to Oregon, must be abandoned. It would be strange, indeed, if the treaty-making power (which, under our constitution, is purely an executive power) could annex territory, and yet that the Executive, and both Houses of Congress combined, could not. Then, if France or Spain had forever refused to cede to us Louisiana or New Orleans, could we never—no, not even by conquest in war—have occupied and annexed them by act of Congress? Congress, then, having the undoubted power to annex territory, and admit new States, and Texas having assented in advance, may be either admitted at once, as a Territory, or a State, or States, or Congress may provide for the prospective admission of one or more States from Texas, as has often heretofore been done as to other new States, the whole question of annexation not being one whether *this government* has the power, but only how it must be exercised; and whether only by one of the branches of this government, or by all combined. And if the power vested in Congress by the constitution to admit new States, does not of itself embrace territory then constituting a part of the Union, as well as all future acquisitions, there is no power to admit new States, except out of territory which was a part of the Union when the constitution was formed; but as this interpretation cannot prevail without expelling three States from the Union, and forbidding the admission of Iowa, it must be conceded that this power of Congress to admit new States does extend to future acquisitions. This being the case, what can be more clear than that Congress may admit a State or States out of Texas, if her assent is given, as we perceive it has been, in a form as obligatory as a treaty? In truth, the power to annex territory by treaty does not so much exist as a mere implication from the treaty-making power, as from the grant to Congress to admit new States out of any territory whatever, although not then a part of the Union; and the right to annex by treaty results mainly as a means of obtaining, when necessary, the assent of another

government, especially when that assent can be obtained in no other manner.

Something like this was done by the annexation, by Congress, of the Florida parishes to the State of Louisiana. They had been claimed, and remained for many years after the cession of Louisiana, in the exclusive occupancy of Spain, when the American settlers revolted, assembled their convention, declared their independence, and, by a successful revolution, wrested this territory from the dominion of Spain, and Congress recognised the acts, and assumed and paid the debts of the insurgent convention; and the legislature of Louisiana, after the adoption of her constitution, and admission into the Union, without this territory, subsequently, by mere legislative enactment, with the consent of Congress, annexed it to the State of Louisiana.

3d. The annexation may be accomplished by one of the States of the Union, with the sanction of Congress.—That each of the States possessed the power to extend her boundaries before the adoption of the constitution, will not be denied; and that the power still exists, is certain, unless it is abandoned by the State in forming the government of the Union. Now, there is no such abandonment, unless it is found in the following clause of the constitution: "No State shall, without the consent of Congress, enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power." Each State, then, may, with the consent of Congress, "enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power." Texas, if not ours, is a foreign power; and if she, by law, assents to the reannexation, in whole or in part, to Louisiana, or to Arkansas, and those States, by law, agree to the annexation, it is "an agreement or compact" between a foreign power and a State of the Union, and is clearly unlawful, with "the consent of Congress." It would not be a treaty, which is the exercise of an executive power, but a compact by law, and precisely similar to the numerous compacts, so called, by which, by acts of Congress and of a State legislature, so many agreements, especially with the new States, have been made by mere legislative enactments. Nor need the assent of Congress be given in advance; it is not so given on the admission of Tennessee, Arkansas, and Michigan; but if given subsequently, it would ratify the previous extension of their boundaries by Louisiana or Arkansas. There are, then, these three modes, by any one of which Texas may be reannexed to the American Union. 1st. By treaty; 2d. By act of Congress, without a treaty; and, 3d. By the act of a State, with the sanction of Congress. But, if it be otherwise, and the constitution only applies to territories then attached to the Union, and delegates no power for the acquisition of any other territory, nor prohibits the exercise of the pre-existing power of each State to extend her boundaries, then there would remain in each State the reserved right of extension, beyond the control of Congress. I have not asserted the existence of such a right in a State; but, if the cases quoted do not confer the authority on Congress, and the reannexation is refused on that ground, then the annexing power, as a right to enlarge their boundaries, would result to any one of the States, and, with the consent of Texas, could be exercised. Receiving, then, what power results to the States, from the denial of the power of annexation by Congress, let us agitate no such question in advance, but let us deny of its own authority by Congress, but discuss the question on its merits alone.

Is it expedient to reannex Texas to the American Union? This is the greatest question, since the adoption of the constitution, ever presented for the decision of the American people. Texas was once our own; and, although surrendered by treaty to Spain, the surrender was long resisted by the American government, and was conceded to be a great sacrifice. This being the case, is it not clear that, when the territory, which we have most reluctantly surrendered, can be reacquired, that object should be accomplished? Under such circumstances, to refuse the reannexation is to deny the wisdom of the original purchase, and to reflect upon the judgment of those who maintained, even at the period of surrender, that it was a great sacrifice of national interests.

Texas, as Mr. Jefferson declared, was as clearly embraced in the purchase by us of Louisiana as New Orleans itself, and that it was a part of that region, is demonstrated by the discovery, by the great LaSalle, of the source and mouth of the Mississippi, and his occupancy for France west of the Colorado. Our right to Texas, as a part of Louisiana, was asserted and demonstrated by Presidents Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and John Quincy Adams. No one of our Presidents has ever doubted our title; and Mr. Clay has ever maintained it as clear and unquestionable. Louisiana was acquired by a treaty with France, in 1803, by Mr. Jefferson; and in the letter of Mr. Madison, the Secretary of State, dated March 31, 1804, he says, expressing his own views and those of Mr. Jefferson, that Louisiana "extended westward to the Rio Bravo, otherwise called Rio del Norte. Orders were accordingly obtained from the Spanish authorities for the delivery of all the posts on the west side of the Mississippi." And in his letter of the 31st January, 1804, Mr. Madison declares that Mr. Laussat, the French commissioner who delivered the possession of Louisiana to us, announced the "Del Norte as its true boundary." Here, then, in the delivery of the possession of Louisiana by Spain to France, and France to us, Texas is included. In the letter of Mr. Madison of the 8th July, 1804, he declares the opposition of Mr. Jefferson to the "*relinquishment of any territory whatever eastward of the Rio Bravo.*" In the letter of James Monroe of the 8th November 1803, he incloses documents which he says "*prove incontestably*" that the boundary of Louisiana is "the Rio Bravo to the west;" and Mr. Pinckney unites with him in a similar declaration. In a subsequent letter—not to a foreign government, but to Mr. Madison—of the 20th April, 1805, they assert our title as unquestionable. In Mr. Monroe's letters, as Secretary of State, dated January 19, 1816, and June 10, 1816, he says none could question "our title to Texas;" and he expresses his concurrence in opinion with Jefferson and Madison, "that our title to the Del Norte was as clear as to the island of New Orleans." In his letter, as Secretary of State, to Don Onis, of the 12th March, 1818, John Quincy Adams says: "The claim of France always did extend westward to the Rio Bravo;" "she *always* claimed the territory which you call Texas as being within the limits, and forming a part, of Louisiana." After demonstrating our title to Texas in this letter, Mr. Adams says: "Well might Messrs. Pinckney and Monroe write to M. Cevallos, in 1805, that the claim of the United States to the boundary of the Rio Bravo was as clear as their right to the island of New Orleans." Again, in his letter of the 31st October, 1818, Mr.

Adams says our title to Texas is "established beyond the power of further controversy."

Here, then, by the discovery and occupation of Texas, as a part of Louisiana, by Lasalle, for France, in 1685; by the delivery of possession to us, in 1803, by Spain and France; by the action of our government, from the date of the treaty of acquisition to the date of the treaty of surrender, (avowedly so on its face;) by the opinion of all our Presidents and ministers connected in any way with the acquisition, our title to Texas was undoubted. It was surrendered to Spain, by the treaty of 1819; but Mr. Clay maintained, in his speech of the 3d April, 1820, that territory *could not be alienated* merely by a treaty; and consequently that, notwithstanding the treaty, Texas was *still our own*. In the cession of a portion of Maine, it was asserted, in legislative resolutions, by Massachusetts and Maine, and conceded by this government, that no portion of Maine could be ceded by treaty without the consent of Maine. Did Texas assent to this treaty, or can we cede part of a territory, but not of a State? These are grave questions; they raise the point whether Texas is not now a part of our territory, and whether her people may not now rightfully claim the protection of our government and laws. Recollect this was not a question of settlement, under the powers of this government, of a disputed boundary. The treaty declares, as respects Texas, that we "*cede to his Catholic majesty*." Commenting on this in his speech before referred to, Mr. Clay says it was not a question of the power in case of dispute "of fixing a boundary previously existing." "It was, on the contrary, the case of an avowed cession of territory from the United States to Spain." Although, then, the government may be competent to fix a disputed boundary, by ascertaining as near as practicable where it is; although, also, a State, with the consent of this government, as in the case of Maine, may cede a portion of her territory,—yet it by no means follows that this government, by treaty, could cede a Territory of the Union. Could we by treaty cede Florida to Spain, especially without consulting the people of Florida? and, if not, the treaty by which Texas was surrendered was, as Mr. Clay contended, *inoperative*.

By the treaty of 1803, by which, we have seen, Texas was acquired by us from France, we pledged our faith to France, and to the *people of Texas*, never to surrender that territory. The 3d article of that treaty declares: "the inhabitants of the ceded territory *shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States*, and admitted as soon as possible, according to the principles of the federal constitution, to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of *citizens of the United States*; and in the *mean time* they shall be protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and the religion which they profess." Such was our pledge to France and to the *people of Texas*, by the treaty of purchase; and if our subsequent treaty of cession to Spain was not unconstitutional and invalid, it was a gross infraction of a previous treaty, and of one of the fundamental conditions under which Texas was acquired.

Here, then, are many grave questions of constitutional power. Could the solemn guaranty to France, and to the people of Texas, be rescinded by a treaty with Spain? Can this government, by its own mere power, surrender any portion of its territory? Can it cut off a territory without the consent of its people, and surrender them and the territory to

a foreign power? Can it expatriate and expel from the Union its own citizens, who occupy that territory, and change an American citizen into a citizen of Spain or Mexico? These are momentous questions, which it is not necessary now to determine, and in regard to which I advance at this time no opinion. Certain, however, it is, that, with the consent of the people of Texas, Congress can carry out the solemn pledges of the treaty of 1803, and admit one or more States from Texas into the Union.

The question as to Texas is, in any respect, a question of the re-establishment of our ancient boundaries, and the repossession of a territory most reluctantly surrendered. The surrender of territory, even if constitutional, is almost universally inexpedient and unwise, and, in any event, when circumstances may seem to demand such a surrender, the territory thus abandoned should always be reacquired whenever it may be done with justice and propriety. Independent of these views, we have the recorded opinion of John Q. Adams as President, and Henry Clay as Secretary of State, and also of Gen. Andrew Jackson as President, and Martin Van Buren as Secretary of State, that Texas ought to be reannexed to the Union. On the 26th of March, 1825, Mr. Clay, in conformity with his own views, and the *express directions of Mr. Adams* as President, directed a letter to Mr. Poinsett, our Minister at Mexico, instructing him to endeavour to procure from Mexico a transfer to us of Texas to the Del Norte. In this letter Mr. Clay says, "the President wishes you to effect that object." Mr. Clay adds: "the line of the Sabine approaches our great western mart nearer than could be wished. Perhaps the Mexican government may not be unwilling to establish that of the Rio Brasso de Dios, or the Rio Colorado, or the Snow Mountains, or the Rio del Norte, in lieu of it." Mr. Clay urges, also, the importance of having entirely within our limits "the Red river and Arkansas, and their respective tributary streams."

On the 15th of March, 1827, Mr. Clay again renewed the effort to procure the cession of Texas. In his letter of instruction, of that date, to our minister at Mexico, he says: "The President has thought the present might be an auspicious period for urging a negotiation at Mexico, to settle the boundary of the two republics." "If we could obtain such a boundary as we desire, the government of the United States might be disposed to pay a reasonable pecuniary compensation. The boundary we prefer is that which, beginning at the mouth of the Rio del Norte in the sea, shall ascend that river to the mouth of the Rio Puerco, thence ascending this river to its source, and from its source by a line due north to strike the Arkansas; thence following the southern bank of the Arkansas to its source, in latitude 33° north; and thence by that parallel of latitude to the South sea." And he adds, the treaty may provide "for the incorporation of the inhabitants into the Union."

Mr. Van Buren, in his letter, as Secretary of State to our Minister at Mexico, dated August 25, 1828, says: "It is the wish of the President that you should, without delay, open a negotiation with the Mexican government for the purchase of so much of the province of Texas as is hereinafter described." "He is induced, by a *deep conviction of the real necessity* of the proposed acquisition, not only as a guard for our western frontier, and the *protection of New Orleans*, but also to secure forever to the inhabitants of the valley of the Mississippi the undisputed and undisturbed possession of the navigation of the

river." "The territory, of which a cession is desired by the United States, is all that part of the province of Texas which lies east of a line beginning at the Gulf of Mexico, in the centre of the desert, or grand prairie, which lies west of the Rio Nueces." And Mr. Van Buren adds, the treaty may provide "for the incorporation of the inhabitants into the Union." And he then enters into a long and powerful argument of his own, in favour of the reacquisition of Texas.

On the 20th of March, 1833, General Jackson, through Mr. Livingston, as Secretary of State, renews to our minister at Mexico the former "instructions on the subject of the proposed cession." On the 2d of July, 1835, General Jackson, through Mr. Forsyth as Secretary of State, renews the instructions to obtain the cession of Texas, and expresses "an anxious desire to secure the very desirable alteration in our boundary with Mexico." On the 6th of August, 1835, General Jackson, through Mr. Forsyth as Secretary of State, directs our minister at Mexico to endeavour to procure for us, from that government, the following boundary, "beginning at the Gulf of Mexico, proceeding along the eastern bank of the river Rio Bravo del Norte, to the 37th parallel of latitude, and thence along that parallel to the Pacific." This noble and glorious proposition of General Jackson would have secured to us, not only the whole of Texas, but also the largest and most valuable portion of upper California, together with the bay and harbour of San Francisco, the best on the western coast of America, and equal to any in the world. If, then, it was deemed, as it is clearly proved, most desirable to obtain the reannexation of Texas, down to a period as late as August, 1835, is it less important at this period?

We find the administration of Messrs. Adams and Clay in 1825 and 1827, and that of Jackson and Van Buren, in 1829, and subsequently in 1833 and 1835, making strenuous efforts to procure the reannexation of Texas, by a purchase from Mexico, at the expense of millions of dollars. Let us observe also the dates of these efforts: That of the first, by Messrs. Adams and Clay, in March, 1825, was within three years only after the recognition of the independence of Mexico by this country, and prior to its full recognition by other powers; and it was within less than five years subsequent to the final ratification of the treaty by which we surrendered Texas, not to Mexico, but to Spain. Now, as Spain had not then recognised the independence of Mexico, and the war was still waging between those nations, the only title which Mexico had to Texas, was by a successful revolution, and is precisely the same title, and depending on the same principles, as that now possessed by Texas. The same remarks apply to the subsequent efforts of Messrs. Adams and Clay in 1827, and of Jackson and Van Buren in 1829, to acquire Texas by purchase from Mexico. And even at the latest period, no more time had elapsed between the date of the recognition of the independence of Mexico, and the proposed purchase from her, than the time (now about seven years) since our recognition of the independence of Texas. Throughout the period of all these proposed treaties, the war was waging between Mexico and Spain. The brave Porter, our own gallant commodore, commanded the Mexican navy, aided by many American officers and crews. In the earlier part, also, of the conflict on the land, the gallant Perry, and the brave Magee, an American officer, with a combined American and Mexican army, had defeated

the royal forces of Spain in many a glorious conflict. Throughout this whole period, Mexico was *soliciting and obtaining* the aid of our countrymen, on the ocean and on the land; and it is more than doubtful whether, in the absence of that assistance, Mexico would yet have achieved her independence. On the 27th July, 1829, Barradas, with a Spanish army of four thousand men, captured the Mexican city of Tampico, which he held until the 10th September of the same year. Yet, on the 25th August, 1829, whilst the fate of this expedition was yet undetermined, the administration of Jackson and Van Buren, as we have seen, proposed the purchase of Texas from Mexico. If, then, there be any force in the objections, that Texas was aided in her conflict by American citizens, that the war is still waging, (which it is not), or that the independence of Texas is still unrecognised by Mexico, or that a treaty with Mexico (as we had with Spain) had been ratified,—all these reasons apply with far greater force against the proposed purchase of Texas from Mexico in 1825, 1827, and 1829, when Mexico was yet unrecognised by Spain; when our treaty, surrendering Texas to Spain, was unrescinded, except by the revolution in Mexico; and when our citizens were still aiding, as they always had done, the people of Mexico in their struggle for independence. It is true, that, in 1837, within a few weeks or months succeeding our recognition of the independence of Texas, and before her recognition by any foreign powers, it might have subjected us to unjust imputations; and therefore might have been deemed inexpedient, *at such a time, and under such circumstances*, to reannex Texas by a treaty to this Union. But now, when seven years have elapsed since our recognition of the independence of Texas; and she has been recognised for many years as an independent power by the great nations of Europe; and her sovereignty fully established, and fully acknowledged, there can be no objection to such a treaty at this period.

The reasons assigned in 1825, 1827, 1829, 1833 and 1835, for the reannexation of Texas, apply now with full force. These reasons were, that the Sabine, as a boundary, was too near New Orleans; that the defence of that city was rendered insecure; and that the Arkansas and Red river, and all their tributaries, ought to be in our own exclusive possession. The present boundary is the worst which could be devised. It is a succession of steps and curves, carving out the great valley of the West into a shape that is absolutely hideous. It surrenders the Red river, and Arkansas, and their numerous tributaries, for thousands of miles, to a foreign power. It brings that power upon the Gulf, within a day's sail of the mouth of the Mississippi, and in the interior, by the curve of the Sabine, within about one hundred miles of the Mississippi. It places that power, for many hundred miles, on the banks of the Red river, in immediate contact with sixty thousand Indian warriors of our own, and with very many thousand of the fiercest savage tribes in Texas, there to be armed and equipped for the work of death and desolation. It enables a foreign power, with such aids, to descend the Red river to the junction of the Mississippi, there to cut off all communication from above or below, to arrest at that point all boats which were descending with their troops and munitions of war for the defence of New Orleans, and fall down suddenly on that city, thus isolated from the rest of the Union, and subjected to certain ruin.

From the mouth of the Mississippi to the Sabine, there is not a single harbour where an American

vessel of war could find shelter, but westward of the mouth of the Sabine, in Texas, are several deep bays and harbours; and Galveston, one of these, has a depth of water equal to that at the mouth of the Mississippi. Looking into the interior, along this extraordinary boundary, we find a foreign power stretching for many hundred miles along the Sabine to the Red river; thence west several hundred miles along that river to the western boundary of our Indian territories; thence north to the Arkansas, and up that stream to the southern boundary of the territory of Oregon, and at a point which, according to the recent most able survey of Lieutenant Fremont, is within twenty miles of the pass of the Rocky Mountains, which secures the entrance to Oregon. We thus place a foreign power there, to move eastward or westward, upon the valley of the Columbia or Mississippi. We place this power north of St. Louis, north of a portion of Iowa, and south of New Orleans, and along this line for several thousand miles in our rear.

Such is the boundary at present given to the valley of the West; such the imminent dangers to which it is subjected of Indian massacre; such the dismemberment of the great valley, and of many of the noblest streams and tributaries of the Mississippi; such the surrender of so many hundred miles of our coast, with so many bays and harbours; such the hazard to which New Orleans is subjected, and the outlet of all our commerce to the gulf. Such is our present boundary; and it can be exchanged for one that will give us perfect security, that will place our own people and our own settlements in rear of the Indian tribes, and that will cut them off from foreign influence; that will restore to us the uninterrupted navigation of the Red river and Arkansas, and of all their tributaries; that will place us at the north, upon a point to command the pass of Oregon, and, on the south, to secure New Orleans, and render certain the command of the Gulf of Mexico. In pursuing our ancient and rightful boundary, before we surrendered Texas, along the Del Norte, we are brought, by a western curve of that great river, to a point within four hundred miles of the Pacific ocean, and where the waters of the Del Norte almost commingle with those that flow into the Western ocean. Up to this point on the Del Norte it is navigable for steamboats; and from that point to the Pacific is a good route for caravans, and where, it is believed, the Pacific may be united with the Del Norte and the Gulf by a railroad, not longer than that which now unites Buffalo and Boston; and where, even now, without such a road, we could command the trade of all the northern States of Mexico, and of a very large portion of the western coast of America.

The importance of Texas is thus described by Mr. Clay, in his speech of the 3d of April, 1820:

"All the accounts concurred in representing Texas to be extremely valuable. Its superficial extent was three or four times greater than that of Florida. The climate was delicious; the soil fertile; the margins of the rivers abounding in live-oak; and the country admitting of easy settlement. It possessed, moreover, if he were not misinformed, one of the finest ports in the Gulf of Mexico. The productions of which it was capable, were suited to our wants. The unfortunate captive of St. Helena wished for ships, commerce, and colonies. We have them all, if we do not wantonly throw them away. The colonies of other countries are separated from them by vast seas, requiring great expense

to protect them, and are held subject to a constant risk of their being torn from their grasp. Our colonies, on the contrary, are united to, and form a part, of our continent; and the same Mississippi, from whose rich deposit the best of them (Louisiana) has been formed, will transport on her bosom the brave, the patriotic men from her tributary streams, to defend and preserve the next most valuable—the province of Texas." "He was not disposed to disparage Florida; but its intrinsic value was incomparably less than that of Texas."

In the letter of instructions from Mr. Madison, as Secretary of State, of the 29th July, 1803, he says, "the acquisition of the Floridas is still to be pursued." He adds, the exchange of any part of western Louisiana, which Spain may propose for the "cession of the Floridas," "is inadmissible." "In intrinsic value there is no equality." "We are the less disposed also to make sacrifices to obtain the Floridas; because their position and the manifest course of events *guaranty an early and reasonable acquisition of them.*" In Mr. Madison's letter, also, as Secretary of State, of the 8th July, 1804, he announces the opposition of Mr. Jefferson "to a perpetual relinquishment of any territory whatever eastward of the Rio Bravo." In the message of President Houston of the 5th May, 1837, he says that Texas contains "four-fifths of all the live-oak now in the world." Cotton will be its great staple, and some sugar and molasses will be produced. The grape, the olive, and indigo, and cocoa, and nearly all the fruits of the tropics will be grown there also. In Texas are valuable mines of gold and silver; the silver mine on the San Saba having been examined and found to be among the richest in the world.

In the recent debate in the British Parliament, Lord Brougham said: "The importance of Texas could not be overrated. It was a country of the greatest capabilities, and was in extent full as large as France. It possessed a soil of the finest and most fertile character, and it was capable of producing all tropical produce; and its climate was of a most healthy character. It had access to the gulf, to the river Mississippi, with which it communicated by means of the Red river." The possession of Texas would ensure to us the trade of Santa Fe and all the northern States of Mexico. Above all, Texas is a large and indispensable portion of the valley of the West. That valley once was all our own; but it has been dismembered by a treaty formed when the West held neither of the high executive stations of the government, and was wholly unrepresented in the cabinet at Washington. The Red river and Arkansas, divided and mutilated, now flow with their numerous tributaries, for many thousand miles, through the territory of a foreign power; and the West has been forced back along the gulf, from the Del Norte to the Sabine. If, then, it be true, that the sacrifice of Texas was made with painful reluctance, all those who united in the surrender will rejoice at the reacquisition.

This is no question of the purchase of new territory, but of the reannexation of that which once was all our own. It is not a question of the extension of our limits, but of the restoration of former boundaries. It proposes no new addition to the valley of the Mississippi; but of its reunion, and all its waters, once more, under our dominion. If the Creator had separated Texas from the Union by mountain barriers, the Alps or the Andes, these might be plausible objections; but He has planed down the whole valley, including Texas, and united every atom of

the soil and every drop of the waters of the mighty whole. He has linked their rivers with the great Mississippi, and marked and united the whole for the dominion of one government and the residence of one people; and it is impious in man to attempt to dissolve this great and glorious Union. Texas is a part of Kentucky, a portion of the same great valley. It is a part of New York and Pennsylvania, a part of Maryland and Virginia, and Ohio, and of all the western states, whilst the Tennessee unites with it the waters of Georgia, Alabama, and Carolina. The Alleghany, commencing its course in New York, and with the Youghiogany, from Maryland, and Monongahela, from Virginia, merging with the beautiful Ohio at the metropolis of western Pennsylvania, embrace the streams of Texas at the mouths of the Arkansas and Red river, whence their waters flow in kindred union to the gulf. And here let me say, that New York ought to reclaim for the Alleghany its true original name, *the Ohio*, of which it is a part, and so marked and called by that name in the British maps, prior to 1776, one of which is in the possession of the distinguished representative from the Pittsburg district of Pennsylvania. The words "Ohio" and "Alleghany," in two different Indian dialects, mean *clear*, as designating truly, in both cases, the character of the water of both streams; and hence it is that New York is upon the Ohio, and truly stands at the head of the valley of the West. The treaty which struck Texas from the Union, inflicted a blow upon this mighty valley. And who will say that the West shall remain dismembered and mutilated, and that the ancient boundaries of the republic shall never be restored? Who will desire to check the young eagle of America, now refixing her gaze upon our former limits, and repluming her pinions for her returning flight? What American will say, that the flag of the Union shall never wave again throughout that mighty territory; and that what Jefferson acquired, and Madison refused to surrender, shall never be restored? Who will oppose the re-establishment of our glorious constitution over the whole of the mighty valley which once was shielded by its benignant sway? Who will wish again to curtail the limits of this great republican empire, and again to dismember the glorious valley of the West? Who will refuse to replant the banner of the republic upon our former boundary, or re-surrender the Arkansas and Red river, and retransfer the coast of the gulf? Who will refuse to heal the bleeding wounds of the mutilated West, and reunite the veins and arteries, dis severed by the dismembering cession of Texas to Spain? To refuse to accept the reannexation, is to *re-surrender* the Territory of Texas, and redismember the valley of the West. Nay, more: under existing circumstances, it is to lower the flag of the Union before the red cross of St. George, and to surrender the Florida pass, the mouth of the Mississippi, the command of the Mexican gulf, and finally Texas itself, into the hands of England.

As a question of money, no State is much more deeply interested in the reannexation of Texas than your own great Commonwealth of Kentucky.—There, if Texas becomes part of the Union, will be a great and growing market for her beef and pork, her lard and butter, her flour and corn; and there, within a very short period, would be found a ready sale for more than a million dollars in value of her bale-ropes and hemp and cotton-bagging. Nor can it be that Kentucky would desire, by the refusal of re-

annexation, to mutilate and dismember the valley of which she is a part; or that Kentucky would curtail the limits of the republic, or diminish its power and strength and glory. It cannot be that Kentucky will wish to see any flag except our own upon the banks of the Sabine and Arkansas and Red river, and within a day's sail of the mouth of the Mississippi, and the outlet of all her own commerce in the gulf. Many of her own people are within the limits of Texas, and its battle-fields are watered with the blood of many of her sons. It was her own intrepid Milan, who headed the brave three hundred who, armed with rifles only, captured the fortress of the Alamo, defended by heavy artillery, and thirteen hundred of the picked troops of Mexico, under one of their best commanders. And will Kentucky refuse to re-embrace so many of her own people? nor permit them, without leaving Texas, to return to the American Union? And if war should ever again revisit our country, Kentucky knows that the steady aim of the western rifleman, and the brave hearts and stout hands, within the limits of Texas, are, in the hour of danger, among the surest defenders of the country, and especially of the valley of the West. The question of reannexation, and of the restoration of ancient boundaries, is a much stronger case than that of the purchase of new territory. It is a stronger case also than the acquisition of Louisiana or Florida: not only upon the ground that these were both an acquisition of new territory, but that they embraced a foreign people, dissimilar to our own, in language, laws, and institutions; and transferred without their knowledge or consent, by the act of an European king. More especially, in a case like this, where the people of Texas occupy a region which was once exclusively our own; and this people, in whom we acknowledge to reside the only sovereignty over the whole and every portion of Texas, desire the reannexation—that we cannot re-establish our former boundaries, and restore to us the whole or any part of the territory which was once our own, is a proposition, the bare statement of which is its best refutation.

Let us examine, now, some of the objections urged against the reannexation of Texas. And here, it is remarkable that the objections to the purchase of Louisiana are the same now made in the case of Texas; yet all now acknowledge the wisdom of that great measure; and to have ever opposed it, is now regarded as alike unpatriotic and unwise. And so will it be in the case of Texas. The measure will justify itself by its results; and its opponents will stand in the same position now occupied by those who objected to the purchase of Louisiana. The objections, we have said, were the same, and we will examine them separately. 1st, The extension of territory; and 2d, the question of slavery.

As to the extension of territory, it applied with much greater force to the purchase of Louisiana. That purchase annexed to the Union a territory double the size of that already embraced within its limits; whilst the reannexation of Texas, according to the largest estimates, will add but one-seventh to the extent of our territory. The highest estimate of the area of Texas is but 318,000 square miles, whilst that of the rest of the Union is 2,000,000 square miles. Now, the British territory, on our own continent of North America, exclusive of the West Indies, and north of our northern boundary, is 2,800,000 square miles, being 500,000 more than that of our whole Union, with Texas united. Indeed, we may add both the Californias to Texas, and unite

them all to the Union, and still the area of the whole will be less than that of the British North American possessions. And is it an American doctrine, that monarchies or despotisms are alone fitted for the government of extensive territories, and that a confederacy of States must be compressed within narrower limits? Of all the forms of government, our confederacy is most specially adapted for an extended territory, and might, without the least danger, but with increased security, and vastly augmented benefits, embrace a continent. Each State, within its own limits, controls all its local concerns, and the general government chiefly those which appertain to commerce and our foreign relations. Indeed, as you augment the number of States, the bond of union is stronger; for the opposition of any one State is much less dangerous and formidable, in a confederacy of thirty States, than of three. On this subject experience is the best test of truth. Has the Union been endangered by the advance in the number of States from thirteen to twenty-six? Look also at all the new States that have been added to the Union since the adoption of the constitution, and tell me what one of all of them, either in war or peace, has ever failed most faithfully to perform its duties; and what one of them has ever proposed or threatened the existence of the government, or the dissolution of the Union? No rebellion or insurrection has ever raised its banner within their limits, nor have traitorous or union-dissolving conventions, in war or in peace, ever been assembled within the boundary of any of the new States of the West; but in peace, they have nobly and faithfully performed all their duties to the Union; and in war, the spirit of party has fled before an ardent patriotism, and all have rushed to the standard of their common country. From the shores of the Atlantic and the lakes of the North; from the banks of the Thames and the St. Lawrence, to those of the Alabama and the Mississippi; from the snows of Canada to the sunny plains of the South—the soil of the Union is watered with the blood of the brave and patriotic citizen soldiers of the West. And is it England would persuade us our territory and population will be too great to permit the reannexation of Texas? Let us see how stands the case with herself and other great powers of the world. The following facts are presented from the most recent geographies:

British empire—area, 8,100,000 square miles; population, 200,000,000.

Russian empire—area, 7,500,000 square miles; population, 75,000,000.

Chinese empire—area, 5,500,000 square miles; population, 250,000,000.

Brazil—area, 3,000,000 square miles; population, 6,000,000.

United States (including Texas)—area, 2,318,000 square miles; population, 19,000,000.

Here is one monarchy, (the British empire,) nearly four times as large as the United States, including Texas; and one monarchy and three despotisms combined, largely more than ten times our area, also including Texas; and to assert, under these circumstances, that our government is to be overthrown or endangered by an addition of one-seventh to its area, is to adopt the exploded argument of kings and despots against our system of confederated States.

President Monroe, a citizen of one of the old thirteen States, in his message of 1823, thus speaks of the effects of the purchase of Louisiana:

"This expansion of our population, and accession of new States to our Union, have had the happiest effect on all its highest interests. That it has eminently augmented our resources, and added to our strength and respectability as a power, is admitted by all. It is manifest, that by enlarging the basis of our system, and increasing the number of States, the system itself has been greatly strengthened in both its branches. Consolidation and disunion have thereby been rendered equally impracticable. Each government confiding in its own strength, has less to apprehend from the other, and in consequence, each, enjoying a greater freedom of action, is rendered more efficient for all the purposes for which it was instituted." It is the system of confederate States, united, but not consolidated, and incorporating the great principle which led to the adoption of the constitution—of *reciprocal free trade* between all the States, that adapt such a government to the extent of a continent. The greater the extent of territory, the more enlarged is the power, and the more augmented the blessings of such a government. In war it will be more certain of success, and therefore wars will be less frequent; and in peace it will be more respected abroad, and enjoy greater advantages at home, and the less unfavourable will be the influence on its prosperity, of the hostile policy of foreign nations. It may then have a home market, which, as the new and exchangeable products of various soils and climates are augmented, will place its industry less within the controlling influence of foreign powers. Especially is this important to the great manufacturing interest, that its home market, which is almost its only market, should be enlarged and extended by the accession of new territory, and an augmented population, embraced within the boundaries of the Union, and therefore constituting a part of the domestic market. By the census of 1840, the total product of the mining and the manufactures of the Union, was \$282,194,985; and of this vast amount, by the treasury report, but \$9,469,962 was exported, and found a market abroad. Almost its only market was the home market, thus demonstrating the vast importance to that great interest of an accession of territory and population at home.

Nor is it only the mining and manufacturing interests that would feel the influence of such a new and rapidly augmenting home market; but agriculture, commerce and navigation, the products of the forest and fisheries, the freighting and ship-building interests, would all feel a new impulse; and the great internal communications, by railroads and canals, engaged in transporting our own exchangeable products, would find a great enlargement of their business and profits, and lead onward to the completion of the present and the construction of new improvements—thus identifying more closely all our great interests, bringing nearer and nearer to each other the remotest portions of the mighty whole, multiplying their trade and intercourse, breaking down the barriers of local and sectional prejudice, and scouting the thought of disunion from the American heart, and leaving the very term obsolete. Indeed, if we measure distance by the time in which it is traversed, this Union, with Texas reannexed, is much smaller in territory than the Union was at the adoption of the constitution. Then, the journey from the capitol to the then remotest corner of the republic, could not be traversed in less than a month; while now, much less than one-half that time will take us to the mouth of the Del Norte.

the extreme southwestern limit of Texas. Such are the conquests which steam has already effected, upon the water and upon the land; and, when we consider the wonderful advance which they are still making, we must begin to calculate a journey upon land, by steam, from the Atlantic to the Del Norte, by hours, and not by weeks or months. And he who, under such circumstances, would still say that Texas was too large or distant for reannexation to the Union, must have been sleeping since the application of steam to locomotion.

But if Texas is too large for incorporation into the Union, why is not Oregon also, which is nearly double the size of Texas? and if Texas is too remote, why is not Oregon also, when ten days will take us to the mouth of the Del Norte, whereas, three months by land, and five months by sea, must be required for the journey to the mouth of the Columbia. Texas, also, is a part of the valley of the Mississippi, watered by the same streams, and united with it by nature, as one and indivisible; whereas Oregon is separated from us by mountain barriers, and pours its waters into another and distant ocean. And if Oregon, although disputed, and occupied by a foreign power, is, as I believe it to be, in truth and justice, all our own, Texas was once, and for many years, within our limits, and may now again become our own by the free and unanimous consent, already given, of all by whom it is owned and occupied. I have not thus contrasted Texas and Oregon with a view to oppose the occupation of Oregon; for I have always been the ardent friend of that measure. I advocated it in a speech published long before I became a member of the Senate, and now, since the death of the patriotic and lamented Linn, I am the oldest surviving member of the special committee of the Senate which has pressed upon that body, for so many years, the immediate occupation of the whole territory of Oregon. There, upon the shores of the distant Pacific, if my vote can accomplish it, shall be planted the banner of the Union; and, with my consent, never shall be surrendered a single point of its coast, an atom of its soil, or a drop of all its waters. But while I am against the surrender of any portion of Oregon, I am also against the *resurrender* of the territory of Texas; for, disguise it as we may, it is a case of *resurrender*, when it once was all our own, and now again is ours, by the free consent of those to whom it belongs, already given, and waiting only the ceremony of a formal acceptance. Let not those, then, who advocate the occupation of Oregon, tell us that Texas is too distant, or too inaccessible, or too extensive for American occupancy. Let the friends of Oregon reflect, also, that Texas, at the head of the Arkansas, is contiguous to Oregon, and within twenty miles of the pass which commands the entrance through all that territory, and the occupation of which pass by a foreign power, would separate the people and territory of Oregon from the rest of the Union, and leave them an easy prey to the army of an invader. In truth, Texas is nearly as indispensable for the safe and permanent occupation of Oregon, as it is for the security of New Orleans and the Gulf.

The only remaining objection is the question of slavery. And have we a question which is to curtail the limits of the republic—to threaten its existence—to aim a deadly blow at all its great and vital interests—to court alliances with foreign and with hostile powers—to recall our commerce and expel our manufactures from bays and rivers that once were all our own—to strike down the flag of the

Union, as it advances towards our ancient boundary—to resurrender a mighty territory, and invite to its occupancy the deadliest (in truth, the only) foe this government has ever encountered? Is anti-slavery to do all this? And is it so to endanger New Orleans, and the valley and commerce and outlet of the West, that we would hold them, not by our own strength, but by the slender tenure of the will and of the mercy of Great Britain? If anti-slavery can effect all this, may God, in his infinite mercy, save and perpetuate this Union; for the efforts of man would be feeble and impotent. The avowed object of this party is the immediate abolition of slavery. For this, they traverse sea and land; for this, they hold conventions in the capital of England; and there they brood over schemes of abolition, in association with British societies; there they join in denunciations of their countrymen, until their hearts are filled with treason; and they return home, Americans in name, but Englishmen in feelings and principles. Let us all, then, feel and know, whether we live North or South, that this party, if not vanquished, must overthrow the government, and dissolve the Union. This party propose the immediate abolition of slavery throughout the Union. If this were practicable, let us look at the consequences. By the returns of the last census, the products of the slaveholding States, in 1840, amounted in value to \$404,429,638. These products, then, of the South, must have alone enabled it to furnish a home market for all the surplus manufactures of the North, as also a market for the products of its forests and fisheries; and giving a mighty impulse to all its commercial and navigating interests. Now, nearly all these agricultural products of the South which accomplish all these great purposes, is the result of slave labour; and, strike down these products by the immediate abolition of slavery, and the markets of the South, for want of the means to purchase, will be lost to the people of the North; and North and South will be involved in one common ruin. Yes, in the harbours of the North (at Philadelphia, New York, and Boston) the vessels would rot at their wharves for want of exchangeable products to carry; the building of ships would cease, and the grass would grow in many a street now enlivened by an active and progressive industry. In the interior, the railroads and canals would languish for want of business; and the factories and manufacturing towns and cities, decaying and deserted, would stand as blasted monuments of the folly of man. One universal bankruptcy would overspread the country, together with all the demoralization and crime which ever accompany such a catastrophe; and the notices at every corner would point only to sales on execution, by the constable, the sheriff, the marshal, and the auctioneer; whilst the beggars would ask us in the streets, not for money, but for bread. Dark as the picture may be, it could not exceed the gloomy reality. Such would be the effects in the North; whilst in the South, no human heart can conceive, nor pen describe, the dreadful consequences. Let us look at another result to the North. The slaves being emancipated, not by the South, but by the North, would fly there for safety and protection; and three millions of free blacks would be thrown at once, as if by a convulsion of nature, upon the States of the North. They would come there to their friends of the North, who had given them freedom, to give them also habitation, food, and clothing; and, not having it to give, many of them would perish from want and exposure;

whilst the wretched remainder would be left to live as they could, by theft or charity. They would still be a degraded caste, free only in name, without the reality of freedom. A few might earn a wretched and precarious subsistence, by competing with the white labourers of the North, and reducing their wages to the lowest point in the sliding scale of starvation and misery; whilst the poor-house and the jail, the asylums of the deaf and dumb, the blind, the idiot and insane, would be filled to overflowing; if, indeed, any asylum could be afforded to the millions of the negro race whom wretchedness and crime would drive to despair and madness.

That these are sad realities, is proved by the census of 1840. I annex in an appendix a table, marked No. 1, compiled by me entirely from the official returns of the census of 1840, except as to prisons and paupers which are obtained from city and State returns, and the results are as follows:

1st. The number of deaf and dumb, blind, idiots, and insane, of the negroes in the non-slaveholding States, is one out of every 96; in the slaveholding States, it is one out of every 672, or seven to one in favour of the slaves in this respect, as compared with the free blacks.

2d. The number of whites, deaf and dumb, blind, idiots, and insane, in the non-slaveholding States, is one in every 561, being nearly six to one against the free blacks in the same States.

3d. The number of negroes who are deaf and dumb, blind, idiots, and insane, paupers, and in prison in the non-slaveholding States, is one out of every 6, and in the slaveholding States, one out of every 154; or twenty-two to one against the free blacks, as compared with the slaves.

4th. Taking the two extremes of north and south, in Maine, the number of negroes returned as deaf and dumb, blind, insane, and idiots, by the census of 1840, is one out of every twelve, and in slaveholding Florida, by the same returns, is one of every eleven hundred and five; or ninety-two to one, in favour of the slaves of Florida, as compared with the free blacks of Maine.

By the report of the secretary of state of Massachusetts (of the 1st November, 1843,) to the legislature, there were then in the county jails, and houses of correction in that State, 4,020 whites, and 364 negroes; and adding the previous returns of the State prison, 255 whites and 32 blacks; making in all 4,275 whites, and 396 free blacks; being one out of every one hundred and seventy of the white, and one out of every twenty-one of the free black population: and by the official returns of the census of 1840, and their own official returns to their own legislature, one out of every thirteen of the free blacks of Massachusetts was either deaf and dumb, blind, idiot, or insane, or in prison—thus proving a degree of debasement and misery, on the part of the coloured race, in that truly great State, which is appalling. In the last official report to the legislature of the warden of the penitentiary of eastern Pennsylvania, he says, "The whole number of prisoners received from the opening of the institution, (October 25, 1829,) to January 1, 1843, is 1622; of these, 1004 were white males, 533 coloured males; 27 white females, and 58 coloured females!" or one out of every 847 of the white, and one out of every sixty-four of the negro population; and of the white female convicts, one out of every 16,288; and of the coloured female convicts, one out of every 349 in one prison, showing a degree of guilt and debasement on the part of the coloured

females, revolting and unparalleled. When such is the debasement of the coloured females, far exceeding even that of the white females in the most corrupt cities of Europe, extending, too, throughout one-half the limits of a great State, we may begin to form some idea of the dreadful condition of the free blacks, and how much worse it is than that of the slaves, whom we are asked to liberate and consign to a similar condition of guilt and misery. Where, too, are these examples? The first is in the great State of Massachusetts, that, for 64 years, has never had a slave, and whose free black population, being 5463 in 1790, and but 8669 at present, is nearly the same free negro population, and their descendants, whom for more than half a century she has strived, but strived in vain, to elevate in rank and comfort and morals. The other example is the eastern half of the great State of Pennsylvania, including Philadelphia, and the Quakers of the State, who, with an industry and humanity that never tired, and a charity that spared not time or money, have exerted every effort to improve the morals and better the condition of their free black population. But where are the great results? Let the census and the reports of the prisons answer. Worse—incomparably worse, than the condition of the slaves, and demonstrating that the free black, in the midst of his friends in the North, is sinking lower every day in the scale of want and crime and misery. The regular physicians' report and review, published in 1840, says the "facts, then, show an increasing disproportionate number of coloured prisoners in the eastern penitentiary." In contrasting the condition, for the same year, of the penitentiaries of all the non-slaveholding States, as compared with all the slaveholding States in which returns are made, I find the number of free blacks is fifty-four to one, as compared with the slaves, in proportion to population, who are incarcerated in these prisons. There are no paupers among the slaves, whilst in the non-slaveholding States great is the number of coloured paupers.

From the Belgian statistics, compiled by Mr. Quetelet, the distinguished secretary of the Royal Academy of Brussels, it appears that in Belgium the number of deaf and dumb was one out of every 2180 persons; in Great Britain, one out of every 1539; in Italy, one out of every 1539; and in Europe, one out of every 1474. Of the blind, one out of every 1009 in Belgium; one out of every 800 in Prussia; one out of every 1600 in France; and one out of every 1666 in Saxony; and no further returns, as to the blind, are given.—[*Belgian Annuaire*, 1836, pages 213, 215, 217.] But the table shows an average in Europe of one out of every 1474 of deaf and dumb, and of about one out of every 1000 of blind; whereas our census shows, of the deaf and dumb whites of the Union, one out of every 2193; and of the blacks in the non-slaveholding States, one out of every 656; also, of the blind, one out of every 2821 of the whites of the Union, and one out of every 516 of the blacks in the non-slaveholding States. Thus we have not only shown the condition of the blacks of the non-slaveholding States to be far worse than that of the slaves of the South, but also far worse than the condition of the people of Europe, deplorable as that may be. It has been heretofore shown that the free blacks in the non-slaveholding States were becoming, in an augmented proportion, more debased in morals as they increased in numbers; and the same proposition is true in other respects. Thus, by the census of 1830, the number of deaf and dumb of the free blacks of the non-

slaveholding States, was one out of every 996; and of blind, one out of every 993; whereas we have seen, by the census of 1840, the number of free blacks, deaf and dumb, in the non-slaveholding States, was one out of every 656; and of blind, one out of every 516. In the last ten years, then, the alarming fact is proved, that the *proportionate* number of free black deaf and dumb, and also of blind, has increased about fifty per cent. No statement as to the insane or idiots is given in the census of 1830.

Let us now examine the future increase of free blacks in the States adjoining the slaveholding States, if Texas is not reannexed to the Union. By the census of 1790, the number of free blacks in the States (adding New York) adjoining the slaveholding States, was 13,953. In the States (adding New York) adjacent to the slaveholding States, the number of free blacks, by the census of 1840, was 42,107; being an aggregate increase of nearly eleven to one in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. Now, by the census and table above given, the aggregate number of free blacks who were deaf and dumb, blind, idiot or insane, paupers, or in prisons, in the non-slaveholding States, was 26,342, or one in every six of the whole number. Now if the free black population should increase in the same ratio, in the aggregate, in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, from 1840 to 1890, as it did from 1790 to 1840, the aggregate free black population in these six States would be, in 1890, 1,600,000; in 1865, 800,000; in 1853, 400,000; and the aggregate number in these six States of free blacks, according to the present proportion, who would then be deaf and dumb, blind, idiot or insane, paupers or in prison, would be, in 1890, 266,666; in 1865, 133,333; and in 1853, 66,666; being, as we have seen, one-sixth of the whole number. Now, if the annual cost of supporting these free blacks in these asylums, and other houses, including the interest on the sums expended in their erection, and for annual repairs, and the money disbursed for the arrest, trial, conviction, and transportation of the criminals, amounted to fifty dollars for each, the annual tax on the people of these six States, on account of these free blacks, would be, in 1890, \$13,333,300; in 1865, \$6,666,600; and in 1853, \$3,333,300.

Does, then, humanity require that we should render the blacks more debased and miserable, by this process of abolition, with greater temptations to crime, with more of real guilt, and less of actual complicity? As the free blacks are thrown more and more upon the cities of the North, and compete more there with the white labourer, the condition of the blacks becomes worse and more perilous every day, until we have already seen, the masses of Cincinnati and Philadelphia rise to expel the negro race beyond their limits. Immediate abolition, whilst it deprived the South of the means to purchase the products and manufactures of the North and West, would fill those States with an inundation of free black population, that would be absolutely intolerable. Immediate abolition, then, has but few advocates; but if emancipation were not immediate, but only gradual, whilst slavery existed to any great extent in the slaveholding States bordering upon the States of the North and West, this expulsion, by gradual abolition, of the free blacks into the States immediately north of them, would be very considerable, and rapidly augmenting every year. If this process of gradual abolition only doubled the number of free blacks, to be thrown upon the States of the North

and West, then, a reference to the tables before presented, proves that the number of free blacks in New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois would be, in 1890, 3,200,000; in 1865, 1,600,000; and in 1853, 800,000; and that the annual expenses to the people of these six States, on account of the free blacks would be, in 1890, \$26,666,400; in 1865, \$13,333,200; and in 1853, \$6,666,600.

It was in view, no doubt, of these facts, that Mr. Davis, of New York, declared, upon the floor of Congress, on the 29th December, 1843, that "the abolition of slavery in the southern States must be followed by a *deluge of black population to the North, filling our jails and poor houses, and bringing destruction upon the labouring portion of our people*." Dr. Duncan also, of Cincinnati, Ohio, in his speech in Congress on the 6th January, 1844, declared the result of abolition would be to inundate the North with free blacks, described by him as "paupers, beggars, thieves, assassins, and desperadoes; all, or nearly all, penniless and destitute, without skill, means, industry, or perseverance to obtain a livelihood; each possessing and cherishing revenge for supposed or real wrongs. No man's fireside, person, family, or property, would be safe by day or night. It now requires the whole energies of the law and the whole vigilance of the police of all our principal cities to restrain and keep in subordination the few straggling free negroes which now infest them." If such be the case now, what will be the result when, by abolition, gradual or immediate, the number of these free negroes shall be doubled and quadrupled, and decupled, in the more northern of the slaveholding States, before slavery had receded from their limits, and nearly the whole of which free black population would be thrown on the adjacent non-slaveholding States. Much, if not all of this great evil, will be prevented by the reannexation of Texas. Since the purchase of Louisiana and Florida, and the settlement of Alabama and Mississippi, there have been carried into this region, as the census demonstrates, from the States of Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and Kentucky, half a million of slaves, including their descendants, that otherwise would now be within the limits of those four States. Such has been the result as to have diminished, in two of these States nearest to the North, the number of their slaves far below what they were at the census of 1790, and to have reduced them at the census of 1840, in Delaware, to the small number of 2605. Now, if we double the rate of diminution, as we certainly will by the reannexation of Texas, slavery will disappear from Delaware in ten years, and from Maryland in twenty, and have greatly diminished in Virginia and Kentucky: As, then, by reannexation, slavery advances in Texas, it must recede to the same extent from the more northern of the slaveholding States; and consequently, the evil to the northern States, from the expulsion into them of free blacks, by abolition, gradual or immediate, would thereby be greatly mitigated, if not entirely prevented. In the District of Columbia, by the drain to the new States and Territories of the South and southwest, the slaves have been reduced from 6,119 in 1830, to 4694 in 1840; and if, by the reannexation, slavery receded in a double ratio, then it would disappear altogether from the District in twelve years; and that question, which now occupies so much of the time of Congress, and threatens so seriously the harmony, if not the existence of the Union, would be put at rest by the reannexation of Texas. This reannexation, then, would only change

the locality of the slaves, and of the slaveholding States, without augmenting their number. And is Texas to be lost to the Union, not by the question of the existence of slavery, but of its locality only? If slavery be considered by the States of the North as an evil, why should they prefer that its location should be continued in States on their border, rather than in the more distant portions of the Union. It is clear that, as slavery advanced in Texas, it would recede from the States bordering on the free States of the North and West; and thus they would be released from actual contact with what they consider an evil, and also from all influx from those States of a large and constantly augmenting free black population. As regards the slaves, the African being from a tropical climate, and from the region of the burning sands and sun, his comfort and condition would be greatly improved, by a transfer from northern latitudes to the genial and most salubrious climate of Texas. There he would never suffer from that exposure to cold and frost, which he feels so much more severely than any other race; and there, also, from the great fertility of the soil, and exuberance of its products, his supply of food would be abundant. If a desire to improve the condition and increase the comforts of the slave really animated the anti-slavery party, they would be the warmest advocates of the reannexation of Texas. Nor can it be disguised that, by the reannexation, as the number of free blacks augmented in the slaveholding States, they would be diffused gradually through Texas into Mexico, and Central and Southern America, where nine-tenths of their present population are already of the coloured races, and where, from their vast preponderance in number, they are not a degraded caste, but upon a footing, not merely of legal, but what is far more important, of actual equality with the rest of the population. Here, then, if Texas is reannexed throughout the vast region and salubrious and delicious climate of Mexico, and of Central and Southern America, a large and rapidly increasing portion of the African race will disappear from the limits of the Union. The process will be gradual and progressive, without a shock, and without a convulsion; whereas, by the loss of Texas, and the imprisonment of the slave population of the Union within its present limits, slavery would increase in nearly all the slaveholding States, and a change in their condition would become impossible; or if it did take place by sudden or gradual abolition, the result would as certainly be the sudden or gradual introduction of hundreds of thousands of free blacks into the States of the North; and if their condition there is already deplorable, how would it be when their number there should be augmented tenfold, and the burden become intolerable? Then, indeed, by the loss of the markets of Texas—by the taxation imposed by an immense free black population, depressing the value of all property—then, also, from the competition for employment of the free black with the white labourer of the North,—his wages would be reduced until they would fall to ten or twenty cents a day, and starvation and misery would be introduced among the white labouring population. There is but one way in which the North can escape these evils; and that is the reannexation of Texas, which is the only safety-valve for the whole Union, and the only practicable outlet for the African population, through Texas, into Mexico and Central and Southern America. There is a congenial climate for the African race. There

cold and want and hunger will not drive the African, as we see it does in the North, into the poor-house and the jail, and the asylums of the idiot and insane. There the boundless and almost unpeopled territory of Mexico, and of Central and Southern America, with its delicious climate, and most prolific soil, renders most easy the means of subsistence; and there they would not be a degraded caste, but equals among equals, not only by law, but by feeling and association.

The medical writers all say, (and experience confirms the assertion,) that ill treatment, overwork, neglect in infancy and sickness, drunkenness, want, and crime, are the chief causes of idiocy, blindness, and lunacy; whilst none will deny that want and guilt fill the poor-house and the jail. Why is it, then, that the free black is (as the census proves) much more wretched in condition, and debased in morals than the slave? These free blacks are among the people of the North, and their condition is most deplorable in the two great States of Maine and Massachusetts, where, since 1780, slavery never existed. Now, the people of the North are eminently humane, religious, and intelligent. What, then, is the cause of the misery and debasement of their free black population? It is chiefly in the fact that the free blacks, among their real superiors—our own white population—are, and ever will be, a degraded caste, free only in name, without any of the blessings of freedom. Here they can have no pride, and no aspirations—no spirit of industry or emulation; and, in most cases, to live, to vegetate, is their only desire. Hence, the efforts to improve their condition, so long made, in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and many other States, have proved utterly unavailing; and it grows worse every year, as that population augments in numbers. In vain do many of the States give the negro the right of suffrage, and all the legal privileges of the whites: the colour marks the dreadful difference which, here, at least, age cannot obliterate. The negroes, however equal in law, are not equal in fact. They are nowhere found in the colleges or universities, upon the bench or at the bar, in the muster, or the jury box, in legislative or executive stations; nor does marriage, the great bond of society, unite the white with the negro, except a rare occurrence of such unnatural alliance, to call forth the scorn or disgust of the whole community. Indeed, I could truly say, if passing into the immediate presence of the Most High, that in morals and comforts, the free black is far below the slave; and that, while the condition of the slave has been greatly ameliorated, and is improving every year, that of the free blacks (as the official tables demonstrate) is sinking in misery and debasement at every census, as, from time to time, by emancipation and other causes, they are augmented in number. Can it, then, be sinful to refuse to change the condition of the slaves to a position of far greater wretchedness and debasement by reducing them to the level of the free-negro race, to occupy the asylums of the deaf and dumb, the blind, the idiot and insane; to wander as mendicants; to live in pestilential alleys and hovels, by theft or charity; or to prolong a miserable existence in the poor-house or the jail? All history proves that no people on earth are more deeply imbued with the love of freedom, and of its diffusion everywhere, among all who can appreciate and enjoy its blessings, than the people of the South; and if the negro slave were improved in morals and comforts, and rendered capable of self-government

emancipation, it would not be gradual, but immediate, if the profits of slavery were tenfold greater than they are. Is slavery, then, never to disappear from the Union? If confined within its present limits, I do not perceive when or how it is to terminate. It is true, Mr. George Tucker, the distinguished Virginian, and professor in their great university, has demonstrated that, in a period not exceeding eighty years, and probably less, from the density of population in all the slaveholding States, hired labour could be as abundant and cheap as slave labour, and at all pecuniary motive for the continuance of slavery would then have ceased. But would it, therefore, disappear? No, it certainly would not; for, at the lowest ratio, the slaves would then number at least ten millions. Could such a mass be emancipated? And if so, what would be the result? We have seen, by the census and other proof, that one-ninth of the free blacks must be supported at the public expense; and that, at the low rate of \$50 each, it would cost \$80,000,000 per annum to be paid by taxation to support the free blacks then in the South requiring support, namely: 1,666,666, if manumission were permitted; but as such a tax could not be collected, emancipation would be as it now is, prohibited by law, and slavery could not disappear in this manner, even when it became unprofitable. No, millions of free blacks, permitted to roam at large to the limits of the South, could never be tolerated. Again, then, the question is asked, is slavery never to disappear from the Union? This is a startling and momentous question, but the answer is easy, and the proof is clear; *it will certainly disappear if Texas is reannexed to the Union*; not by abolition, but against and in spite of all its frenzy, slowly, and gradually, by diffusion, as it has already thus nearly receded from several of the more northern of the slaveholding States, and as it will continue thus more rapidly to recede by the reannexation of Texas, and finally, in the distant future, without a shock, without abolition, without a convulsion, disappear into the South, through Texas, into Mexico and Central and Southern America. Thus, that same overruling Providence that watched over the landing of the emigrants and pilgrims at Jamestown and Plymouth; that gave us the victory in our struggle for independence; that guided by His inspiration the framers of our wonderful constitution; that has thus far preserved this great Union from dangers so many and so imminent, and is now shielding it from abolition, the most dangerous and internal foe—will open Texas as a safety-valve, into and through which slavery will slowly and gradually recede, and finally disappear into the boundless regions of Mexico, and Central and Southern America. Beyond the Del Norte, slavery will not pass; not only because it is forbidden by law, but because the coloured races there preponderate in the ratio of ten to one over the whites; and holding, as they do, the government, most of the offices in their own possession, they will never permit the enslavement of any portion of the coloured race which makes and executes the laws of the country. In Bradford's Atlas, the facts are given as follows:

Mexico—area, 1,690,000 square miles; population 10,000,000—one-sixth white, and all the rest Indians, Mexicans, mulattoes, zambos, and other coloured races.

Central America—area, 186,000 square miles; population nearly 2,000,000—one-sixth white, and the rest negroes, zambos, and other coloured races.

South America—area, 6,500,000 square miles;

population 14,000,000—1,000,000 white, 4,000,000 Indians; and the remainder, being 9,000,000, blacks and other coloured races.

The outlet for our negro race, through this vast region, can never be opened but by the reannexation of Texas; but in that event, there, in that extensive country, bordering upon our negro population, and four times greater in area than the whole Union, with a sparse population of but three to the square mile, where nine-tenths of the population is of the coloured races, there, upon that fertile soil, and in that delicious climate, so admirably adapted to the negro race, as all experience has now clearly proved, the free black would find a home. There, also, as slaves, in the lapse of time, from the density of population and other causes, are emancipated, they will disappear from time to time west of the Del Norte, and beyond the limits of the Union, among a race of their own colour; will be diffused throughout this vast region, where they will not be a degraded caste, and where, as to climate, and social and moral condition, and all the hopes and comforts of life, they can occupy, among equals, a position they can never attain in any part of this Union.

The reannexation of Texas would strengthen and fortify the whole Union, and antedate the period when our own country would be the first and greatest of all the powers of the earth. To the South and Southwest it would give peace and security; to agriculture and manufactures, to the products of the mines, the forest, and fisheries, new and important markets, that otherwise must soon be lost forever. To the commercial and navigating interests, it would give a new impulse; and not a canal or a railroad throughout the Union, that would not derive increased business, and augmented profits; whilst the great city of New York, the centre of most of the business of the Union, would take a mighty step in advance towards that destiny which must place her above London in wealth, in business and population. Indeed, when, as Americans, we look at the city of New York, its deep, accessible and capacious harbour, united by canals and the Hudson, with the St. Lawrence and the lakes, the Ohio, and the Mississippi, with two-thirds of the imports, and one-third of the exports of the whole Union, with all its trade, internal, coastwise, and foreign, and reflect how great and rapidly augmenting an accession to its business would be made by the reannexation of Texas; and know that, by the failure of this measure, what is lost to us is gained by England, can we hesitate, or do we never wish to see the day when New York shall take from London the trident of the ocean, and the command of the commerce of the world? Or do we prefer London to New York, and England to America? And do the opponents of reannexation suppose that a British Parliament, and not an American Congress, sits in the capitol of the Union. Shall, then, Texas be our own, with all its markets, commerce, and products, or shall we drive it into the arms of England, now outstretched to receive it, and striving to direct its destiny? If we refuse the reannexation, then, by the force of circumstances, soon passing beyond the control as well of this country as of Texas, she will pass into the hands of England. The refusal of reannexation will, of course, produce no friendly feelings in Texas towards this country. United with this will be the direct appeal of England to the interests of Texas. She will offer to Texas a market in England, free of duty, for all her cotton, upon the assent of Texas to receive it

exchange British manufactures free of duty; and such a treaty would no doubt soon be concluded. The ships and merchants and capital of England will be transported to the coast of Texas. Texas has neither ships, nor capital, nor manufactures, but England will supply all, and receive in return the cotton of Texas. Two nations with reciprocal free trade are nearly identical in feeling and interest, except that the larger power will preponderate, and Texas become a commercial dependency of England, and isolated from us in feelings, in interest, in trade, and intercourse. Texas would then be our great rival in the cotton markets of the world, and she would have two vast advantages over the cotton-growing interests of the Union: 1st, in sending to England her cotton, free of duty, which is an advantage of 7½ per cent., augmented five per cent. thereon by the act of 15th May, 1840, 3 Victoria, chap. 17, which made the duties paid in England on our cotton crop of 1840, \$3,247,800, and all which, to the extent of their crop, would be saved to the planters of Texas, giving them this great advantage over our planters, carried out into all the goods manufactured in England out of the free cotton of Texas, and also depriving our cotton manufacturers of the advantage they now enjoy from this duty, over the cotton manufacturers of England. 2d. In enabling the planters of Texas to receive, in exchange for their cotton, the cheap manufactures of England free of duty. These two causes combined, would give the Texas cotton planters an advantage of at least 20 per cent. over the cotton planters of the Union. Such a rivalry we could not long maintain; and cotton planting would gradually decline in the Union, and with that decline, would be lost the markets of the South for the hemp, and beef, and pork, and flour of the West, and the manufactures of the North. Now, is it just, is it safe or expedient, to place the South and the Southwest in a position in which they will constantly behold an adjacent cotton-growing country supplanting them in the culture and sale of their great staple, for the reason that the *one is*, and the other *is not*, a part of the Union? Must we behold Texas every day selling her cotton to England free of all duty, whilst our cotton is subjected to a heavy impost? and must we also perceive Texas receiving in exchange the manufactures of England free of duty, whilst here they are excluded by a prohibitory tariff? Can the tariff itself stand such an issue; or, if it does, can the Union sustain the mighty shock? Daily and hourly, to the South and Southwest, would be presented the strong inducement to *unite with Texas*, and secure the same markets free of duty for their cotton, and receive the same cheap manufactures, free of duty, in exchange. Nor would these be the only dangers incurred, and temptations presented, by this fearful experiment. We would see the exports of Texas carried directly abroad from *their own ports*, and the imports brought into *their own ports* directly in exchange; thus building up their own cities, and their own commerce, whilst here, they would see that same business transacted for them, chiefly in New York, Boston, and Philadelphia. They would see New York receiving annually one hundred millions of imports, nearly fifty millions of which was for resale to them, and all which they would receive directly in their own ports if united with Texas, thus striking down nearly one half the commerce of the great city of New York, and transferring it to the South and Southwest. The South and Southwest, whilst they

would perceive the advancing prosperity of Texas and their own decline, would also feel, that the region with which they were united had placed them in this position, and subjected them to these disasters by the refusal of reannexation. Whatever the result may be, no true friend of the Union can desire to subject it to such hazards; and this alone ought to be a conclusive argument in favour of the reannexation of Texas. One of three results is certain to follow from the refusal of reannexation: 1st. The separation of the South and Southwest from the North, and their reunion with Texas. 2d. The total overthrow of the tariff. Or, 3d. A system of unbounded smuggling through Texas into the West, and Southwest. Accompanying the last result, would be a disregard of the laws, and an utter demoralization of the whole country, a practical repeal of the tariff, and loss of the revenues which it supplies, and a necessary resort to direct taxation to support the government.

As a commercial dependency, Texas would be almost as much under the control of England as if she were a colony of England; and in the event of war between that nation and this, the interests of Texas would all be on the side of England. It would be the interest of Texas, in the event of such a war, to aid England to seize New Orleans, or at least in blockading the mouth of the Mississippi, so as to exclude the cotton of the West from a foreign market, and leave Texas almost the entire monopoly. Even if Texas were neutral, certainly our power would not be so strong in the gulf for the defence of New Orleans and the mouth of the Mississippi, as if we owned and commanded all the streams which empty into it—as if their people were our countrymen, and all the rivers and harbours and coast of Texas were our own. We should be weaker, then, without Texas, even if she remained neutral; but we have shown it would be her interest to exclude our cotton from foreign markets, and to co-operate with England for that purpose. But if she did remain neutral, could she preserve, or would England respect her neutrality? Without an army, ships, or forts, no one will pretend that a neutral position could be maintained; and England could enter any of her streams or harbours, and take possession of any of her soil at pleasure. Would she do so in the event of a war with America? Let the events of the last war answer the question. Then, within sight of Valparaiso, within the waters of neutral Spain, she captured the *Essex*, after a sanguinary and glorious defence. This was as complete a violation of the neutral rights of Spain, under the law of nations, as if we had entered upon her soil to molest us. At Porto Praya, and Tunis, she captured other American vessels, within the harbours and under the guns of the forts of neutral powers; and, indeed, all the neutral ships and goods, and all the maritime rights of neutral nations, she acted the part of the pirate and buccaneer, rather than of a civilized kingdom, and violated the neutral rights of all the world. These were her lawless acts confined to the coasts and harbours of neutral powers, but extended also to the actual use and occupation of their soil. During the last war, Spain was at peace with England and America; but England, in open violation of the neutral rights of Spain, seized upon a portion of Florida (then a Spanish territory), whence she fulminated her incendiary appeal to the slaves for a servile surrection and massacre; and commenced, at Pen-

cola, her first preparations for the attack of New Orleans. And such, precisely, would be the conduct of Great Britain, in the event of another war with America. She would land suddenly at any point of the coast of Texas, and move along the Sabine, in the territory of Texas, to the great bend, where it approaches within about one hundred miles of the Mississippi; and the intermediate territory being but thinly settled, she could advance rapidly across, seize the passage of the Mississippi, and cut off all communication from above, and descend upon New Orleans. Or she might proceed a little further, through the territory of Texas to Red river, the southern bank of which is within the limits of Texas, and equip her expedition; then by water descend the Red river, exciting a servile insurrection, and seize the Mississippi at the mouth of Red river. All these movements she might and would make through Texas. In this way she would seize and fortify her position on the Mississippi, and New Orleans must fall, if cut off from all communication from above. But, even if she only retained the single point on the Mississippi, it would as effectually command its outlet, and arrest its commerce ascending or descending, as if possessed of New Orleans. Whatever point she seized on the Mississippi, there she would entrench and fortify, and tens of thousands of lives, and hundreds of millions of dollars, would be required in driving her from this position. All this would be prevented by the reannexation of Texas. The Sabine and Red river would then be all our own, and no such movement could be made for the seizure of the Mississippi. Nor should it be forgotten, that, when she reached the Red river, and at a navigable point upon its southern bank in Texas, there she would meet sixty thousand Indian warriors of our own, and half as many of Texas, whom her gold, and her intrigues and promises, would, as they always have done, incite to the work of death and desolation. If we desire to know what she would do under such circumstances, let us look back to Hampton and the Raisin, and they will answer the question. If for no other reason, the fact that for many hundred miles you have placed these Indians on the borders of Texas, separated only by the Red river, and on the frontiers of Louisiana and Arkansas, demands that, as an act of justice to these States, and as essential for their security and that of the Mississippi, you should have possession of Texas. Our boundary and limits will always be incomplete, without the possession of Texas; and without it the great valley and its mightiest streams will remain forever dismembered and mutilated. Now, if we can acquire it, we should accomplish the object; for, in all probability, the opportunity now neglected will be lost forever. There may have been good reasons, a few weeks or months succeeding the recognition of the independence of Texas, and before it was recognised by any other power, why it might then have been premature to have reannexed the territory; but now, when eight years have elapsed since the declaration and establishment of the independence of Texas, and seven years since it was recognised by us, and several years since the recognition by France, Holland, and England, there can be no possible objection to the measure.

I have shown that, in the event of a war with England, Texas, if we repelled her from our embrace, would become a complete dependency of England, alienated from us in feeling, in trade and intercourse, and identified in all with England. But would it rest here? No. Texas would first become

a dependency, and then, in fact, a colony of England; and her arms, and ships, and power, would be thus transported to the mouth of the Mississippi. The origin of the immense empire of England in India, was in two small trading establishments. Then followed a permanent occupancy of part of the coast; and India in time became a British colony. And so will it be with Texas, which can furnish England—what it is *now ascertained* India never can—a supply of cotton. The largest vote ever given in Texas was about 12,000. Of this the British emigrants and British party now number about 1000, which, by the unfriendly feelings created by a final refusal of reannexation, and the necessity of seeking another alliance, would be immediately increased to 4000, leaving a majority of 4000 only against a union with England. Immediately a rapid emigration from England to Texas would be commenced under their colonization laws, which give the emigrant a home, and make him a voter in six months, and 5000 English emigrants would overcome the majority of 4000, and give England, through the ballot-box, the command of Texas. The preparation for this colonization of Texas from England has already been made. One English contract has already been signed with the government of Texas, for the emigration there of one thousand families; and three thousand one hundred more would give the *majority to England*. It may be, to avoid the difficulty as to slavery at home, the nominal government for local purposes would be left with Texas, or rather with English voters and merchants in Texas; but in all that concerns the commerce and foreign relations of Texas, in all that concerns the occupancy and use of Texas in the event of war, the supremacy and authority of the British Parliament would be acknowledged. Much is concealed as regards the ultimate designs of England in regard to Texas; for to acknowledge them now would be to defeat them, by insuring reannexation to the Union; but enough has transpired to prove her object. Let us examine the facts. Three treaties were made between Great Britain and Texas, viz. on the 13th, 14th, and 16th of November, 1840. The preamble of one of these is as follows:—

“Her Majesty, the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, being desirous of putting an end to the hostilities which still continue to be carried on between Mexico and Texas, has offered her mediation to the contending parties, to bring about a pacification between them.”

Article 1. “The republic of Texas agrees that if, by means of the mediation of her Britannic Majesty, an unlimited truce shall be established between Mexico and Texas, within 30 days after this present convention shall have been communicated to the Mexican government by her Britannic Majesty’s mission at Mexico; and if, within six months from the day that that communication shall have been so made, Mexico shall have concluded a treaty of peace with Texas, then, and in such case, the republic of Texas will take upon itself a portion amounting to £1,000,000 sterling of the capital of the foreign debt contracted by the republic of Mexico, before the 1st of January, 1835.”

The first article of the next treaty declares:—“There shall be reciprocal liberty of commerce and navigation between and amongst the citizens of the republic of Texas and the subjects of her Britannic Majesty.” The third article authorizes *British merchants* to carry on their business in Texas, and *British vessels of war* to enter freely all her ports.

Next comes a treaty between Great Britain and Texas, which grants to England the *right of search* as fully and effectually, and in terms more obnoxious, than the celebrated quintuple treaty to which it refers and adopts. It grants to the vessels of war of both parties, the right of searching merchant vessels by either party, and expressly provides for the exercise of this right "IN THE GULF OF MEXICO." It provides also for the exercise of this right, whenever either of the parties shall have reason to *suspect* that the vessel is or *has been* engaged in the slave-trade, or has been *fitted out* for the said trade; and all this is to be done, whether the vessel carries the flag of Texas or not. For saving us from the consequences of the quintuple treaty, and the right of search which it granted, by inducing France to refuse to ratify that treaty, General Cass, our minister there, has received and deserved the thanks of the whole American people. He demonstrated that such a right of search would be fatal to the free navigation of the ocean, and subject the commerce of the world to the supervision of British cruisers. But here is a treaty, containing all the obnoxious provisions of the quintuple treaty in regard to the right of search, and others that are still more dangerous. That treaty was made, too, with nations differing in language, and in many other respects, from our own, and therefore more easily distinguishable than the people and vessels of Texas. As the flag is not to designate the national character of the vessel, how can these vessels of Texas, that are thus to be *suspected* on suspicion, be distinguishable; and what is to prevent American vessels and American crews from being carried for condemnation within the ports of England? Recollect, also, that under this treaty, the cruisers of England, and, indeed, the whole British navy, or any part of it, may be brought into the *Gulf of Mexico*, and stationed in the narrow pass, commanding the whole outlet of the Gulf, and all the commerce to and from the Mississippi. To the right of search, under whatever name or form, especially within our own seas, and upon our own coasts, we never have assented, and never can assent; but here, under pretext of searching the vessels of Texas, the navy of England, or any part of it, may occupy the only outlet of the Gulf of Mexico, and all our vessels entering the Gulf, or returning from the mouth of the Mississippi, must pass by and under the supervision of British cruisers, subject to seizure and detention, on suspicion of being Texian vessels concerned in the slave-trade. The British navy may thus also be quartered on the southern coast of Florida, and along the coasts of Cuba and Mexico, to seize upon Cuba whenever an opportunity presents. Such is the influence which it is thus proved, by official documents, Great Britain has already obtained in Texas. It is here proved that Great Britain "offered her mediation" to Texas to obtain peace with Mexico, and that she has already induced Texas to assume, conditionally, one million pounds sterling of the debt which Mexico owes in England, with all the accumulating interest from the 1st of January, 1835. A nation so feeble as Texas, which should owe so heavy a debt in England, with the payments secured by treaty, would be as completely within British influence as though already a British colony, especially when we consider the other most extraordinary privileges which she has already granted to England, including the right of search. In the official proclamation of June 15, 1843, President Houston says: "An official communication has been received at the Department of State, from

her *Britannic Majesty's* chargé d'affaires near this government, founded upon a despatch he had received from her Majesty's chargé d'affaires in Mexico, announcing to this government the fact that the President of Mexico would forthwith order a cessation of hostilities on his part; therefore, I, Sam. Houston, President of the Republic of Texas, do hereby declare and proclaim that an armistice is established, to continue during the pendency of negotiations between the two countries, and until due notice of an intention to resume hostilities (should such an intention hereafter be entertained by either party) shall have been formally announced through her *Britannic Majesty's* chargé d'affaires at the respective governments." Is not Texas *already dependent upon England*, when England obtains for her an armistice, and the President of Texas announces that this will continue until its termination be announced by *England*?

In the message of the President of Texas of the 12th of December, 1843, he speaks of the "generous and friendly disposition, and active and friendly offices of England." He speaks, also, of "injuries and indignities inflicted" by this government upon Texas, and declares "that reparation has been demanded." Such is the wonderful advance in Texas of the influence of England, that she has succeeded in having it announced in an executive message to the people of Texas, that *England is their friend, and that we are their enemies*. If all this had been predicted three years since, it would have been deemed incredible; and if Texas is not reannexed, she is certain, within a few years more, to become first a commercial dependency, and then a colony, in fact, if not in name, of England. When we regard the consequences which have already followed the mere apprehension of the refusal of reannexation, what will be the result in Texas when reannexation is positively and forever rejected? When this is done, and Texas is repulsed with contempt or indifference; when her people are told, the flag of the Union shall never wave over you, go!—go where you may, to England, if you please—who can doubt the result? To doubt is wilful blindness; and whilst we will have lost a most important territory, and an indispensable portion of the valley of the West, England will have gained a dependency first, and then a colony; and we shall awake from our slumbers when, amid British rejoicings and the sound of British cannon, the flag of England shall wave upon the coast and throughout the limits of Texas, and a monarchy rises up on our own continent and on our own borders, upon the grave of a republic. Yes, this is not a question merely between us and Texas, but a question between the advance of British or American power; and that, too, within the very heart of the valley of the West. It is a question, also, between the advance of monarchy and republicanism throughout the fairest and most fertile portion of the American continent, and is one of the mighty movements in deciding the great question between monarchy and republicanism, which of the two forms of government shall preponderate throughout the world. In the North, the flag of England waves from the Atlantic to the Pacific over a region much more extensive than our own; and if it must float also for several thousand miles upon the banks of the tributaries of the great Mississippi, and along the Gulf, from the Sabine to the Del Norte, we will be surrounded on all sides by England in America. In the Gulf, her supremacy would be clear and absolute; and in the great interior, she would hang on the rear of Louisiana and

Arkansas, and within two days' march of the Mississippi, while her forts would stand, and her flag would wave, for more than a thousand miles, on the banks of the Arkansas, the Sabine, and Red river, and in immediate contact with sixty thousand Indian warriors of our own, and half as many more of what would then be British Indians, within the present limits of Texas. If any doubt her course as to the Indians, let them refer to her policy in this respect during the revolution and the last war, and they will find that the savage has always been her favourite ally, and that she has shed more American blood, by the aid of the tomahawk and scalping-knife, than she ever did in the field of fair and open conflict. And has she become more friendly to the American people? Look at her forts and her traders, occupying our own undoubted territory of Oregon; look at her press in England and Canada, teeming with abuse of our people, government, and laws; look at her authors and tourists, from the more powerful and insidious assaults of Alison, descending in the scale to the falsehoods and arrogance of Hall and Hamilton, and down yet lower to the kennel jests and vulgar abuse of Marryatt and Dickens, industriously circulated throughout all Europe; and never was her hostility so deep and bitter, and never have her efforts been so great to render us odious to all the world. The government of England is controlled by her aristocracy, the avowed enemies of republican government, wherever it may exist. And never was England endeavouring to advance more rapidly to almost universal empire, on the ocean and the land. Her steamers, commanded by naval officers, traverse nearly every coast and sea, whilst her empire extends upon the land. In the East, the great and populous empires of Scinde and Afghanistan have been virtually subjected to her sway, whilst yet another province now bleeds in the claws of the British lion. Though saturated with blood, and gorged with power, she yet marches on her course to universal dominion; and here, upon our own borders, Texas is next to be her prey. By opium and powder, she has subdued China, and seized many important positions on her coast. In Africa, Australasia, and the Isles of the Pacific, she has wonderfully increased her power; and in Europe, she still holds the key of the Mediterranean. In the Gulf of Mexico, she has already seized, in Honduras, large and extensive possessions, and most commanding positions, overlooking from the interior the outlet of the gulf; while British Guiana, in South America, stretching between the great Orinoco and the mighty Amazon, places her in a position (aided by her island of Trinidad, at the mouth of the Orinoco) to seize upon the outlet of those gigantic rivers. With her West India islands, from Jamaica, south of Cuba, in a continuous chain to the most northern of the Bahamas, she is prepared to seize the Florida pass, and the mouth of the Mississippi; and let her add Texas, and the coast of Texas, and her command of the gulf will be as effectual as of the British channel. It would be a *British sea*; and soon, upon the shores of the gulf, her capital would open the great canal which must unite (at the isthmus) the Atlantic and Pacific, and give to her the key of both the coasts of America. Her possessions in the world are now nearly quadruple the extent of our own; with more than tenfold the population, and more than our area on our own continent; and, while she aims openly at the possession of Oregon on the north, Texas on the west is to become hers by a policy less daring, but more certain in its results. We can yet rescue Tex-

as from her grasp, and, by reannexation, insure at least the command of our own great sea, and the outlet of our own great river. And shall we neglect the reacquisition, and throw Texas, and the command of the gulf, into the arms of England? Whoever would do so, is a monarchist, and prefers the advance of monarchical institutions over our own great valley: he is also an Englishman in feelings and principle, and would recolonize the American States.

And when Texas, by the refusal of reannexation, shall have fallen into the arms of England, and the American people shall behold the result, let all who shall have aided in producing the dread catastrophe flee from the wrath of an indignant nation, which will burst forth like lava, and roll in fiery torrents over the political graves of all who shall thus have contributed to the ruin of their country. And who would place England at New Orleans or the mouth of the Mississippi? Who would place England on the banks of the Sabine, the Arkansas, and Red river? Who would place England along the coasts, and bays, and harbours, and in the great interior of Texas, and see her become a British colony, or—what is the same to us—a British commercial dependency? Could Texas be a power friendly to us, even if not a British colony? Would our refusal of reannexation secure her friendship? Would her rivalry in our great staple insure her good will? Would the monopoly of her trade by England increase her attachment to ourselves? No. Let reannexation be now finally refused, and she becomes a foreign and a hostile power, with all her interests antagonistical to our own. Indeed, all history tells us that there is no friendship between foreign and contiguous nations, presenting so many points of collision, so many jarring interests, and such a rivalry in the sale and production of the same great staple.

Much is now urged in many of the States in favour of securing a home market for our manufactures. Now here in Texas is a home market, that may be secured forever, of incalculable and rapidly increasing value—a market that is already lost to us for the present, as the table of exports demonstrates, and, all must admit, will be thrown, by the rejection of reannexation, into the possession of England; for, whether Texas does or does not become a British colony, it is certain that a treaty of reciprocal free trade would secure to England the monopoly of her markets and commerce. The cotton of Texas would find a market free of duty in England, and her manufactures a market free of duty in Texas, whilst discriminating imposts on our vessels and cargoes would effectually exclude them from her ports. Although England might not, so long as her treaty with us remained uncancelled, receive gratuitously the cotton of Texas free of duty; yet we concede the principle, and act upon it, that she may do it, not gratuitously, but for a consideration, viz: that Texas receives in return British manufactures free of duty;—and such we know is to be the first result of the final rejection of reannexation. Thus England would effectually monopolize the commerce and business of Texas, and in her harbours would float the flag of the English mercantile marine, soon to be the precursor of the next step in the drama of our disgrace and ruin; when the flag of England would float over a British province, carved out of the dismembered valley of the West. But if this last result were not certain; if it were only probable and contingent,—is it not wise and patriotic to arrest the danger, and remove all doubt by the sure preventive remedy of reannex-

ation? But if Texas should only become a British commercial dependency, and not a colony, the danger to us, we have seen, would be nearly as great in the event of war, in the one case, as in the other. But even if not a dependency, we have seen she would be too feeble to guard her rights as a neutral power; and that England, as she always heretofore has done in the case of neutrals, would seize upon her soil, her coast, her harbours, her rivers, and our and her Indians, in her invasion of the valley of the West; and the only certain measure of defence and protection is the reannexation of Texas.

The defence of the country and of all its parts against the probable occurrence of war, is one of the first and highest duties of this government. For this we build forts and arsenals, dry docks and navy-yards, supply arms and ordnance, and maintain armies and navies at an annual expense of many millions of dollars; and for this we guard great cities and important bays and harbours.—From the organization of the government under the constitution, up to the latest period in 1843, for which detailed statements are given, we have expended for the War Department, \$374,868,899, and for the Naval Department, \$173,236,569—being for both \$548,125,468; for the civil list, \$61,385,373; for foreign intercourse, \$35,051,772; miscellaneous, \$61,578,168;—making for these three last items, \$157,915,310; and for the public debt, \$451,749,003;—making the total expenditures, \$1,157,789,781. Now if, to the expenditures for the defence of the country, as above given—\$548,125,468—we add that portion of the public debt which may be fairly estimated as having been incurred for the defence of the country, it would make \$948,125,468 expended for the defence of the country; and leave \$209,664,313 expended for all other purposes. The defence of the country was the great object for which the government was founded, and for this purpose, nearly all the moneys collected from the people have been expended; and yet, of this vast amount, but \$2,208,000 have been expended for fortifications in Louisiana; and New Orleans and the mouth of the Mississippi are still to a great extent undefended. When we consider that nearly the whole commerce of the West floats through this outlet, amounting now to \$220,000,000 per annum, and rapidly augmenting every year, has not the West a right to demand a defence, complete and effectual, of this great river? Now, Mr. Adams and Mr. Clay, in 1825 and 1827, in attempting to secure the reannexation of Texas, say: “the line of the Sabine approaches our great Western mart nearer than could be wished;” and in 1829, General Jackson and Mr. Van Buren announce “the real necessity of the proposed acquisition,” “as a guard for the western frontier, and the protection of New Orleans.” If, then, the defence of the country be one of the main objects and highest duties of this government, and to accomplish which it has expended nearly all the moneys collected from the people, can it be unconstitutional or improper to acquire Texas, as a mere question of defence and protection, when we are assured, that the acquisition is a matter of “real necessity,” “as a guard for the frontier and the protection of New Orleans?” And surely this protection is as necessary now as it was in 1825, 1827, 1829, 1833, and 1835; and New Orleans and Texas, and the frontier and the Sabine, stand precisely where they did at those periods. Indeed, I have now before me a letter of General Jackson, almost fresh from his pen, in which he announces his opinion that the reannexation of Texas “is essential to the United

States.” Although some of my countrymen may differ from me as to the exalted opinion which I entertain of the high civil qualifications of General Jackson, none will dispute his extraordinary military talents, and that no man living can know so well what is necessary to the protection of New Orleans, as its great and successful defender. If, then, the reannexation of Texas be more essential to the safety and defence of New Orleans, and the mouth of the Mississippi, than all the fortifications which could be, but have not been, and will not be, erected in that quarter, has not the West a right to demand, on this ground alone, the reacquisition of Texas? The money of the West, as the treasury reports above quoted demonstrate, is now freely disbursed, and has been expended by hundreds of millions, for the defence of the Atlantic States; and will not those States feel it a duty and a pleasure to defend the West, and their own products, which float upon its mighty rivers, by the repossession of a territory which is essential for our security and welfare? To refuse the reannexation, is to refuse the defence of the West in the only way in which that defence will be complete and effectual; for you may extend your fortifications along the whole coast of the gulf, and New Orleans, and the mouth of the Mississippi, and the Florida pass will remain undefended, so long as Texas is in the possession of a foreign power, and we are open to attacks from the rear through that region. Fortifications, also, may sometimes be captured by a great superiority of guns and force, by squadrons upon the sea; and with a sufficient time and adequate force, if not by storm, by mine and siege, they may be always taken by assaults upon the land—even Gibraltar and the Moro castle not having always proved impregnable. But Texas, our own, and in the possession of the brave and practised marksmen of the West, would be a position, where, against all attacks from the rear, every inch of ground would be fiercely contested, and every advance would be marked by the blood of the invader; and if New Orleans should be invaded in other directions, our countrymen in Texas, over whom would then float the flag of the Union, would rush to the rescue of their own great city, and, uniting with their brethren in arms from other States of the same great Union, would re-enact, upon the banks of the Mississippi, the victories of San Jacinto and New Orleans. If, then, we are true to the West and South-west, we will, if there were no other reasons, as a question of defence, re-acquire the possession of Texas: or do patriotism, and love of the whole country, and of all its parts, exist only in name? Does the American heart yet beat with all their glorious impulses? or are they mere idle words, fitted only to round off a period, or fill up an address? And have we reached that point in the scale of descending degeneracy, when the inquiry is, not what will best strengthen and defend the whole, but what will most effectually impair the strength, retard the growth, and weaken the security of the valley of the West?

Let us now examine the effect of the reannexation of Texas on the whole country. The great interests of the Union, as exhibited in the census of 1840, are shown in the products of agriculture, of the mines and manufactures, of the forests and fisheries, of commerce and navigation. I hereto append tables marked Nos. 2 and 3, compiled from the census of 1840, the first exhibiting the products that year of agriculture, manufactures, commerce, mining, the forest and fisheries; and the second showing the number of persons then employed in agriculture,

manufactures, commerce, mining, navigating the ocean, and internal navigation. I have also compiled from the official report of the Secretary of the Treasury in 1840, a table marked No. 4, representing for the year preceding, for each State, the imports and exports of each, distinguishing the domestic from the foreign exports; also the number of American vessels which entered or cleared from each State; the American crews employed; the foreign vessels which entered and cleared from each State; the vessels built in each State, and tonnage owned by each. Table No. 5, compiled from the same report, exhibits, for the same year, our exports to each of the countries of the world, distinguishing the foreign and domestic exports, with the number of American vessels and foreign vessels employed in our trade with each country, together with the imports from each, and the excess in our trade with any of them, of exports to over imports from them. Table No. 6, compiled from the same report, presents all the exports of our own products that year to Texas, ranged under the heads of the products of agriculture, manufactures, forest and fisheries, distinguishing the articles thus exported, and their value. With these facts before us, which are all official, let us proceed to the examination of this great question. Our chief agricultural exports to Texas, as the table shows, were pork, ham, bacon, lard, beef, butter, cheese, flour, bread, and bread stuff, amounting to \$163,641. In looking at the census of 1840, the population of each State and section, and the amount of these products in each State, we will find that the chief surplus of these products raised for sale beyond their limits, were in the middle States, composed of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland, including the District of Columbia; and in the northwestern States, composed of Missouri, Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Michigan, including also Wisconsin and Iowa. The middle and northwestern States derived, then, the principal profit in the sale of agricultural products to Texas. In the sale of domestic manufactures to Texas, the New England States came first; and next in their order, the middle, and the northwestern States; and in looking at the principal items of which these export manufactures to Texas were composed, I find that the surplus produced and sold to Texas, Massachusetts stood first, and Pennsylvania second. Next to commerce, as connected with Texas, the middle States stood first, and then the New England and northwestern States; and here New York stood first, Massachusetts second, and next Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Ohio. But here we must remark the special interest which Louisiana, through her great port New Orleans, has in commerce as connected with Texas. The total products from commerce in Louisiana in 1840 were \$7,868,898, being one-tenth of that of the whole Union, and consequently the interest of New Orleans, as connected with the reannexation of Texas, must soon be measured by millions every year. The great city of New York, into which is received, in round numbers, one hundred millions of the one hundred and forty-three millions of our imports in the year referred to, and one-third of the exports, has a vast and transcendent interest in this question; for it is, in truth, a question to be settled in our favour by the reannexation of Texas. Whether New York or Liverpool shall command her commerce. Next as to the products of mining, the middle States stand first; and next the Northwestern and New England States. And here Pennsylvania stands at the head of the list, having \$17,446, or nearly one-half of the whole mining

interest of the Union. Texas, having no mines of coal or iron, must become a vast consumer of the products of the mines of Pennsylvania. In cables, bar-iron, and nails, and other manufactures of our iron, Texas imported from us, in the year referred to, the value of \$120,184. Now, of cast-iron, Pennsylvania produced, in 1840, 98,335 tons, being largely more than one-third of the amount produced in the whole Union; and next came Ohio, Kentucky, New York, Virginia, Tennessee, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Maryland. Of bar-iron, the amount produced in Pennsylvania was 87,244 tons, being very nearly one-half of the whole produced in the Union; and next came New York, with 53,693 tons, or more than one-fourth of the whole; and then Tennessee, Maryland, Ohio, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Virginia, Kentucky, and Connecticut. As connected with her vast interests in iron, must be considered also the coal in Pennsylvania, not only as an article of sale abroad, but as consumed at home, in producing her iron; the number of tons thus consumed in 1840, of her own mines, being 355,903 tons, or very nearly one-fourth of that of the whole Union. Coal and iron are scattered in juxtaposition, throughout nearly the whole of Pennsylvania; and, as the markets for her iron are augmented, in the same proportion will increase the consumption of the coal used in producing that iron. Now, in 1840, the amount of anthracite coal produced in the whole Union was 863,489 tons; of which Pennsylvania produced 859,686, or nearly the whole. Of bituminous coal, the total product of the Union was 27,603,191 bushels; of which Pennsylvania produced 11,620,654, or nearly one-half the whole. Let us observe here, also, the remarkable fact, that the three adjacent States of Delaware, New Jersey, and New York, produced no coal, either anthracite or bituminous; and the future interest of Pennsylvania, as connected with that great article, becomes of transcendent importance; and this, together with iron, and the manufactures connected with them, is to determine the value of her public works, and fix her future destiny. Up to a certain point of density, an agricultural State, with a rich soil, advances most rapidly; but when all the lands are cleared and cultivated, this augmentation ceases. It is otherwise, however, with a State possessing, throughout nearly every portion, inexhaustible mines of coal and iron, and wonderful adaptation to manufactures. There, when the soil has been fully cultivated, the development of the mines and manufactures, and the commerce and business connected with them, only fairly begins. Agriculture is limited by the number of acres; but for the products of mines and manufactures, such as Pennsylvania has within her boundaries, there is no other limit than the markets she can command; and this is not merely theory, but is demonstrated by the comparative progress of the various nations of the world. Look, then, at the great amount—certainly not less than three hundred thousand dollars—of the products of the industry of Pennsylvania, consumed by Texas in her infancy, with a population of less than two hundred thousand in 1839, and when those products were, to a considerable extent, excluded by the then existing tariff of Texas, and without which she certainly would then have consumed at least half a million of the products of the industry of Pennsylvania, had she been a state of the Union. But in ten years succeeding the reannexation, at the lowest rate of progress of population to the square mile of the other new States, she would contain a population of two millions; and consequently consume five mil-

lions of the products of the industry of Pennsylvania, or one-fifth of all the surplus products of the mines and manufactures of that great State, sold beyond her limits in 1840. The principal products of Texas will be cotton and sugar, and besides the iron used in all agricultural implements, as well as in the manufactures consumed by an agricultural people, the use of iron in the cotton and sugar mills is very great. There all the great iron apparatus and machinery connected with the cotton gin and press, and the iron boilers and kettles and grates and furnaces used in the making of sugar, is greater than in any other employment. Together with this, is the steam engine, now universally employed in making sugar, and being employed also in the ginning of cotton; and the iron that must be used by Texas, as she develops her resources, must be great indeed; and the question depending on the reannexation, is, whether Texas shall become a part of our home market, and whether England, or Pennsylvania and other States, shall supply her wants. There is another fact which must lead to a vast consumption of coal in Texas, and that is this: that from the banks of the Red river to the coast of the gulf, excepting only the cross timbers, and some other points, chiefly along her streams, Texas is almost exclusively a prairie country; and yet, (what is not very usual, except in northern Illinois, and some other portions of the West,) the soil of these prairies is inexhaustibly fertile. From these causes, wood and fuel must be scarce in Texas, and the coal of Pennsylvania and other States must find a market there of almost incalculable value.

We come next to the products of the forest: and here the middle States stand first, and then the New England and northwestern States. New York here stands first, and then, in their order, Maine, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Ohio. From Olean point on the Alleghany river, in New York, and down that stream through Pennsylvania, the lumber that now descends the Mississippi is very considerable, and of which, including the products from the forest from other quarters of the Union, Texas already took from us, as the table shows, in 1839, to the value of \$157,474. The product of the fisheries of the whole Union, in 1840, was \$11,996,008, of which New England produced \$9,424,555, and the middle States \$1,970,930. Of the products of these fisheries, Texas already took, in 1839, to the value of \$43,426, which, as Texas has no fisheries, must be vastly augmented hereafter. By the treasury report of 1840, as exhibited in table No. 4, the number of vessels built that year in the whole Union was 858; and here the New England States stood first, and then the middle and northwestern States; and Massachusetts was first, and then, in their order, Maine, Maryland, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Connecticut. Now, by table No. 5, it is shown that the clearances of American vessels to Texas, from the United States, and of entries into the United States of American vessels from Texas, was, in the whole, in 1839, 608, being two-thirds of the whole number of vessels built in that year in the United States; and our crews employed in navigating these American vessels thus employed that year in our trade with Texas, were 4,727. The number of American vessels which cleared for Texas in 1839, was greater than to any one of fifty-seven out of sixty-three of all the enumerated countries of the world. It was greater, also, than the whole aggregate number of our vessels which cleared that year for France, Spain, Russia, Prussia, Sweden, Norway, Denmark,

Belgium, and Scotland combined. The same disposition also exists as regards the crews, and also in the American vessels which entered the United States from Texas, and the crews employed. The same tables demonstrate that, of the foreign vessels which entered the United States from Texas, in 1839, eighteen only, out of 4105, entered our ports from Texas; and sixteen foreign vessels only cleared from the United States in that year for Texas, out of 4036; showing that our trade with Texas, in 1839, stood nearly upon the footing of our great coastwise trade, and was conducted almost exclusively in American vessels. Having shown the large number of American crews concerned in the trade with Texas, and the great amount of wages they must have earned, let us now look at the States which made these profits. By the census of 1840, the whole number of persons employed in navigating the ocean was 56,021, of which number 42,154 were from New England, and 9,713 from the middle States. And here Massachusetts stood first, and then Maine, and next, in their order, New York, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Louisiana, and New Jersey. In looking, also, to the States which owned the tonnage employed in this navigation, we find, by table No. 4, from the treasury report, that the New England States stood first, and then the middle States; and that the largest amount was owned by Massachusetts, and next, in their order, by New York, Maine, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Louisiana, Connecticut, and New Jersey. When we consider the products of the fisheries consumed, and that will be consumed, by Texas, and the tonnage and crews employed in that trade, the reannexation must greatly augment our mercantile marine, and thus enable it to supply our navy, whenever necessary, with an adequate number of skilful, brave, and hardy seamen, to defend, in war, our flag upon the sea. The number of persons employed in internal navigation, (including our lakes, rivers, and canals,) by the census of 1840, was 33,076; more than one-half being from the middle States and next the States of the North-west. The largest number was from New York, and next, in their order, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Virginia, Maryland, and Missouri. Here, the States which have constructed great canals, on which are transported the exchangeable products of the Union, have a vast interest in the reannexation of Texas. Of these canals, the great works in New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio are already completed; and those of Indiana, and Illinois approach a completion, whilst Maryland and Virginia are pausing in the construction of their great works, the value of all of which would be greatly augmented, and business increased, by the reannexation of Texas. And here let me say one word of the Old Dominion. She borders upon the Ohio and Atlantic, and when her great works shall unite their waters by one direct and continuous canal, her connexion with the West, and with Texas as a part of it, will be most intimate and important and through the very heart of the State would flow a vast amount of the commerce connected with the Ohio and the Mississippi. And she also has other great and peculiar interests connected with the reannexation of Texas. The amount of cast and iron furnished by her in 1840, was 24,696 tons; of bituminous coal, 10,622,345 bushels; and of domestic salt, 1,745,618 bushels; of wheat, \$3,345,781 value; of the product of animals, \$8,352,278; and of cotton manufactures, \$1,632,040; of all of which articles Texas, as the table of exports shows, is a very large consumer.

From the official treasury report of 1840, I give the table No. 6, for the year commencing the 1st of October, 1838, and closing on the 30th of September, 1839, showing our commerce that year with Texas, and all the other nations of the world. This shows that the total of our exports of domestic produce to Texas that year, was \$1,379,065, and the total of all our exports to Texas that year, \$1,087,082; that the imports the same year from Texas were \$318,116, leaving an excess in our favour, of exports over imports, of \$1,368,906. Thus the extraordinary fact is exhibited, that in the very infancy of her existence, the balance of trade in our favour with Texas, exceeded that of each of all the foreign countries of the world—two only excepted; and these two were colonies of an empire, our trade to the whole of which presented a balance of several millions against us. Texas then, that year, furnished a larger balance of exports over imports in our favour, than any other one of the empires of the world. The totality of our exports that year to Texas was greater than to either Russia, Prussia, Sweden and Norway, Denmark, Belgium, Scotland, Ireland, Spain, Portugal, Italy, Sicily, or China. It was greater also than to each of fifty-six of the sixty-six enumerated countries of the world. It was greater also than the aggregate of all our exports to Spain, Prussia, Denmark, Italy, Sweden and Norway, Portugal, New Grenada, Australasia, French Guiana, Sarinina, Morocco and Barbary States, and Peru combined.

By table No. 6, it appears that the exports of our domestic products in 1839 to Texas was—of the fisheries, \$43,426; of the products of the forest, \$157,474; of the products of agriculture, \$205,860; and of our manufactures, \$929,071. Now, by table No. 6 of the treasury report, the total exports, the same year, of the products of the fisheries to all the world, except Texas, was \$1,864,543; and consequently the exports of the products of the fisheries to Texas, that year, amounted to about 2½ per cent. of those exports to all the rest of the world. The exports of the products of the forest, that year, to all other countries, except Texas, by the same table, was \$5,607,085; consequently the export of those products, that year, to Texas, amounted to 3 per cent. of those exports to all the rest of the world. The exports of our agricultural products, (excluding cotton, rice, and tobacco,) that year, to all other countries, except Texas, (and including molasses, inaccurately placed in the table of manufactures,) was \$1,156,057; and consequently the exports of these products that year to Texas, amounted to more than 1 per cent. of the agricultural exports that year to all the rest of the world. By the same table, the export of all our manufactures in 1839 (exclusive of gold and silver coin) to all other countries, except Texas, was \$3,217,562. Now, the exports of our domestic manufactures, that year, to Texas being \$929,071, consequently Texas consumed of our domestic manufactures, in 1839, AN AMOUNT LARGELY EXCEEDING ONE-FOURTH, AND NEARLY EQUAL TO ONE-THIRD OF OUR DOMESTIC MANUFACTURES EXPORTED ABROAD, AND CONSUMED THERE, BY ALL THE REST OF THE WORLD. Such are the astounding results established by the official report of the Secretary of the Treasury, under date of the 25th, 1840, and to be found in vol. 8 Senate documents for that year, No. 577. Such was our trade with Texas the year ending 30th September, 1839, before her independence was recognised by any other power except by this republic, and before she had entered into commercial treaty with any

other power; and therefore stood to us in the relation, in many respects, as regards her trade, as a territory of the Union. Now, the treaty of amity and commerce between France and Texas was signed at Paris on the 25th of September, 1839; the treaty of amity and commerce between Holland and Texas was signed at the Hague on the 18th of September, 1840; the treaty of commerce between Great Britain and Texas was signed at London on the 13th of November, 1840; all which have been long since ratified. Now, let us observe the effect upon our trade with Texas, of her introduction into the family of nations, by the recognition of her independence by other nations, and treaties of commerce with them; thus placing her towards us in the attitude of a foreign state. The resolution offered by me in the Senate of the United States for the recognition of the independence of Texas, was adopted on the 2d of March, 1837; and with that year commence the tables of our exports to Texas as a new empire, inscribed on the books of the treasury. These tables, in the treasury reports of our exports to Texas, exhibit the following result:

Our exports to Texas in 1837	- \$1,007,928
" " 1838	- 1,247,880
" " 1839	- 1,087,082
" " 1840	- 1,218,271
" " 1841	- 808,206
" " 1842	- 406,329
" " 1843	- 190,604

If our exports to Texas had augmented from 1839 to 1843, as they had done from 1837 to 1839, and as they must have done with her great increase of business and population, but for her being placed towards us, in the mean time, in the attitude of a foreign state, they would have amounted, in 1843, to \$3,047,000, instead of \$190,600. Such has been the immense reduction in our exports to Texas, created by her recognition by other nations, and commercial treaties with them, since 1839. But great as were our exports to Texas in 1839, they were by no means so large as if she had then been a State of the Union; for she then had, and still has, in force a tariff on imports, varying on most articles from 10 to 50 per cent., which must have prohibited some of our exports there, and diminished others. Our tariff, also, did not embrace Texas, and secure to our manufactures almost a monopoly in her supply. Had all these causes combined, as they would have done, had Texas been a State of the Union, our exports there of domestic articles must have reached, in 1843, \$7,164,139, as I shall proceed to demonstrate:

The products of Louisiana, by the census of 1840, were \$35,044,959, of which there was, in sugar and cotton, \$15,476,783; and of this, there was of sugar, \$4,797,908; of which sugar, if we deduct \$476,783, as consumed in the State, being more than double her proportionate consumption, it would leave \$15,000,000 of products raised and exported by Louisiana in 1840, when her population was 352,411; and Texas, producing now in the same proportion to her present population of 200,000, would produce \$19,886,360, and of exports for sale beyond her limits, \$8,522,724; and deducting from this \$1,258,585, the proportion of her products employed in the purchase of foreign products for her use, would leave \$7,164,139 of the products of Texas used in the purchase of articles from other States of the Union. But if reannexed to the Union, in ten years thereafter, how much would she purchase of the products of other States of the Union? If we allow Texas to increase in the same ratio to the square mile as the

State of Louisiana after the first census succeeding the purchase from 1810 to 1820, the population, in ten years, occupying the 318,000 square miles of Texas, would exceed two millions; and the increase in many States has been much more rapid. But estimated at two millions, Texas would then, according to the above proportion, consume \$71,641,300 per annum of the products of other States, which consumption would be rapidly increasing every year; and her annual products then would be \$198,863,600; which, also, would be greatly and constantly augmenting. Such is the wealth we are about to cast from us, and the *home market* we are asked to abandon; for when we see that, by the failure of reannexation, our domestic exports in 1843, to Texas, had fallen to \$140,320; and this, multiplied by ten, would give the consumption, at the end of ten years, of our products by Texas, \$1,403,200, it makes an annual loss of a market for our products to the amount of \$70,238,100; and the loss would be greater, if Texas then, as a foreign State, consumed of our exports in proportion to their consumption by the rest of the world, which would reduce her purchase of our products to \$230,000, and make our loss \$71,411,390 per annum; and if we add to this the loss of revenue from the duties on imports, and the loss of the proceeds of the sales of her public lands, estimated at \$170,139,158, which would all be ours by reannexation, the national loss, by the rejection of Texas, must be estimated by hundreds of millions. Nor is it the trade of Texas only that would be lost, but that of Santa Fe, and all the northern States of Mexico, which, with the possession by us of Texas and the Del Norte, would become consumers of immense amounts of our manufactures and other products, and would pay us to a great extent in silver, which is their great staple. Texas, also, has valuable mines of gold and silver, and this also would be one of her great exports, with which she would purchase our products; and thus, by her specie infused into our circulation, render our currency more secure, and subject us to less danger of being drained to too great an extent of gold and silver. Our exports of domestic products, by the treasury report of 1840, amounted to \$103,533,896, deducting which from our whole products by the census of 1840, would leave \$959,600,845 of our own products, consumed that year by our own population of 17,062,453; and the consumption of our domestic products, (\$103,533,896,) by the population of the world, (900,000,000,) would make an average consumption of \$56 in value of our products consumed by each one of our own people, and *eleven cents* in value of our products consumed on the average by each person beyond our limits; and thus it appears that one person within our limits consumes as much of our own products as 509 persons beyond our limits; thus proving the wonderful difference, as regards the consumption of the products of the Union, between Texas now and in all time to come, as a foreign country, or as a part of the Union. When we reflect, also, that the products of Texas are chiefly of those articles among the few which find a market abroad, it furnishes her with the means to purchase, with the proceeds of those exports, the surplus products of other States, which do not produce these exports; and therefore, the accession of such a country to the Union is vastly more important to the great manufacturing interest than if Texas did not raise such exports, but became a rival producer of our own domestic manufactures. Hence it must be obvious, independent of the proof here exhibited, that the New England States, the middle

and northwestern States, would derive the principal profit from the reannexation of Texas. Pennsylvania standing first, and then Massachusetts and New York; and of the cities, Pittsburg, Cincinnati, and New Orleans, Boston, New York, Baltimore, and Philadelphia. The city which will derive the greatest advantage, in proportion to her population, undoubtedly will be Pittsburg, not only from the wonderful extent and variety of her manufactures, but also from her position. The same steamboat, constructed by her skillful workmen, which starts from Pittsburg, at the head of the Ohio, freighted with her manufactures, can ascend the Red river for many hundred miles, into one of the most fertile regions of Texas, and return to the iron city with cargo of cotton, there to be manufactured for sale in Texas, and other sections of the Union. The steamboats of Pittsburg, also, can descend the Mississippi to the gulf, and coasting along its shores to Galveston, Matagorda, and the other ports of Texas, then dispose of their cargoes of manufactures, and bring back the cotton and sugar of Texas, and also the gold and silver which will be furnished by her mines in great abundance, whenever they are worked with sufficient skill and capital. Pittsburg is a great western city; and whether she shall soon be the greatest manufacturing city of the world, depends upon the markets of the west, and especially on the market of Texas—which, we have seen, can alone be secured by reannexation, and, without it, must be lost forever. And shall Pittsburg complain that new States are to be added in the West? Why the new States of the West have made Pittsburg all that she is, and all that she ever will be; and each addition to their number will only still more rapidly augment her markets, her business, her wealth, and population. Nor can Pittsburg advance without the correspondent improvement of Philadelphia, and of all the great interior of Pennsylvania, throughout the whole line of internal communication that binds together the two great cities of the Keystone State. While it is true that New England, and the middle and northwestern States will derive the greatest profit directly from the reannexation of Texas, the South and Southwest from the augmentation of the wealth and business of the North—produced, not by restrictions on the South and Southwest, but in reciprocal free trade with Texas and all the States—will then also gain in New England, and in the middle and northwestern States, a larger and more able purchaser, and more extensive and better markets for all their exports. Indeed, so great will be the mutual benefits from this measure, that I do not hesitate to record the opinion that, in ten years succeeding the reannexation, with just and fair legislation, there will be more American cotton than manufactures in this Union than now is, or then will be, in England; and we shall begin to look to the prices current of our own cities to regulate the market, and not to England, to raise or depress, at her pleasure, the value of the great American staple. The North wants more markets at home for the products of her industry, and attempts to secure those of the South and Southwest by the tariff; while they complain that this most certainly depresses the price of their great staple, and as surely deprives them of the means of purchasing the products and manufactures of the North. But, upon grounds undisputed by the friends or opponents of a tariff, Texas must perish, as a part of the Union, in any event, a market for many of its products, upon the principle of reciprocal free trade among the States—that great

principle which led to the adoption of the constitution, and which has done more than all other causes combined to advance our interest.

Upon the rejection of reannexation, it will be utterly impossible to prevent the smuggling of British and foreign goods, to an almost incalculable extent, through Texas into the Union, thus not only depriving our manufacturers of the markets of Texas, but also of the markets of the whole valley of the West. This difficulty is already experienced to a small extent in Canada, although we have mostly a dense population upon our side, and located in a region of the north, generally highly favourable to the tariff, and deeply interested, as they suppose, in detecting and preventing smuggling. But the difficulty in Texas will be far greater. There, the line of division is, first, the Sabine—a very narrow stream, far different from the lakes of the North, and the great St. Lawrence—as a boundary; and from the Sabine, for a long distance, a mere geographical line to the Red River, along that stream for many hundred miles, and then another long geographical line to the Arkansas, and thence many hundred miles along that stream to its source, and thence to latitude 42°. Here is a boundary of fifteen hundred miles, and a very large portion of it mere geographical lines, running through the very centre of the great valley of the Mississippi. Could an army of revenue officers, even if all were honest and above temptation, guard such a distance, and such a frontier, against the smuggler; and that, too, in the midst of a population on both sides deeply hostile to the tariff; many of them regarding it as unconstitutional, and therefore that it is right, in their judgment, to evade its operation? These difficulties were foreseen by Mr. Van Buren, and constitute a strong argument, urged by him in his despatch of 1829, in favour of the reannexation of Texas. He there urges the difficulty of establishing a proper custom house at the mouth of the Sabine, without which, he says, even in that direction, “it is impossible to prevent that frontier from becoming the seat of an EXTENSIVE SYSTEM OF SMUGGLING.” It is true, that a custom house on our side of the Sabine, and with numerous and faithful officers, might diminish smuggling in that direction; but as by the treaty, *now in force with Texas*, all vessels entering Texas through the Sabine, must pass unmolested, and land their cargoes at any point on the Sabine, could smuggling be prevented in that direction?

But if smuggling could be prevented through the Sabine, there is the harbour of Galveston, entirely in Texas, and with a depth equal to that at the mouth of the Mississippi; and there is the river Trinity, (emptying into that harbour,) also entirely in Texas, and navigable to a point not far from Red River, within the boundaries of Texas; and up and through these streams into Arkansas and Louisiana, and the valley of the West, it would be utterly impossible to prevent smuggling. The duties upon many articles under our present tariff, range from 50 to 250 per cent. Upon India cotton bagging, they amount to 250 per cent. on the foreign price current; on many articles of iron, to 100 per cent.; and upon glass, and nearly all low-priced goods affected by the minimum principle, there are very high duties. With these articles introduced into Texas free of duty, can they be kept out of the adjacent States, when the facilities and temptation to smuggling will be so very great? This smuggling will be encouraged by the manufacturers of England, and their agents and merchants in Texas, whose cities would be built up as the entrepôts of such a traffic. What

English manufacturers will do, by an organized system of fraudulent invoices and perjury, to evade our duties, was proved in the late investigation in New York. British courts, also, have refused to notice offences against our revenue laws; and the high authority of Sir William Blackstone has been invoked, where he says, in reference to this subject, “These prohibitory laws do not make the *transgression* a moral offence, or sin; the only obligation in *conscience* is to submit to the penalty if *levied*.” And such is the opinion of thousands of our countrymen; and many thousands more believe that the present tariff is unconstitutional, and hence that it is of no force or validity, and that it is not criminal to disregard its provisions. However strong, then, might be my opposition to smuggling, there are hundreds of thousands, both in England and America, who believe it is not criminal; and their number will be greatly augmented, when goods, free of duty, may be introduced into Texas, and premiums under our tariff, from 50 to 250 per cent. are offered, to induce the illicit traffic. Most certainly then, the refusal of reannexation will REPEAL THE TARIFF, by the substitution of smuggled goods in place of American manufactures; the fair trader will be undersold and driven out of the market by the illicit traffic, and smuggling become almost universal, and the commerce of the country transferred from New York, and the ports of the North, to the free ports of Texas. This disregard of the laws would bring the government into contempt, and finally endanger the Union, if, indeed, it did not induce a degeneracy and demoralization always fatal to the permanence of free institutions. Nor is it necessary, to effect these results, that Texas should become a colony, or even a commercial dependency of England; nor yet that there should be between these powers a treaty of reciprocal free trade. Texas (there being no separate States, and but one government to support, and having no expense of any revenue system) may maintain her single government at an actual expense of \$300,000, which sum she can, as is now clearly ascertained, derive from the sales of her magnificent public domain, embracing, as we have seen, 136,000,000 of acres. Let it be known then, and proclaimed as a *certain truth*, and as a result which can *never hereafter be changed or recalled*, that, upon the refusal of reannexation, now and in all time to come, THE TARIFF, AS A PRACTICAL MEASURE, FALLS WHOLLY AND FOREVER; and we shall thereafter be compelled to resort to direct taxes to support the government. Desirable as such a result (the overthrow not only of a protective, but even of a revenue tariff, and the substitution of direct taxation) might be to many in the South and Southwest, yet the dreadful consequences which would flow from this illicit traffic to the cause of morals, of the Union, and of free government, cannot be contemplated without horror and dismay.

Having now, gentlemen, fully replied to your communication, let me assure you that I shall persevere in the use of all honourable means to accomplish this great measure, so well calculated to advance the interests and secure the perpetuity of the American Union. That Union, and all its parts, (for they are all a portion of our common country,) I love with the intensity of filial affection; and never could my heart conceive, or my hand be raised to execute, any project which could effect its overthrow. I have ever regarded the dissolution of this Union as a calamity equal to a second fall of mankind—not, it is true, introducing, like the first,

sin and death into the world, but greatly augmenting all their direful influences. Such an event it would not be my wish to survive, to behold, or participate in the scenes which would follow; and, among the reasons which induce me to advocate so warmly the reannexation of Texas, is the deep conviction, long entertained, that this great measure is essential to the security of the South, the defence of the West, and highly conducive to the welfare and perpetuity of the whole Union. As regards the division of Texas into States, to which you refer, it seems to me most wise first to get the territory; and, when we have rescued it from England, and secured it to ourselves, its future disposition must then be determined by the joint action of both Houses of Congress; which, from their organization, will decide all these questions in that spirit of justice and equity in which the constitution was framed, and all its powers should be administered. I perceive that

your meeting and your committee was composed of both the great parties which divide the country, and that you propose that the reannexation of Texas should not be made a sectional or a party question. Most fortunate would be such a result, for this is, indeed, a great question of national interests, too large and comprehensive to embrace any party or section less than the whole American people.

Accept, gentlemen of the committee, for yourselves, and that portion of the people of the great and patriotic Commonwealth of Kentucky whom you represent on this occasion, and in reply to whose call upon me this answer has been given, the assurances of the respect and consideration of

Your fellow citizen,

R. J. WALKER.

To Messrs. GEO. N. SANDERS, HENRY RAMEY, JR., F. BLEDSOE, W. B. LINDSAY, JAMES P. COX, &c., Committee.

TABLES APPENDED TO MR. WALKER'S LETTER.

Table No. 1, compiled from Census of 1840, of Deaf and Dumb, Blind, Idiots, and Insane.

STATES AND TERRITORIES.	White population.	Coloured population.	WHITE.			COLOURED.				
			Deaf & dumb.	Blind.	Insane & idiots	Deaf & dumb.	Blind.	Insane & idiots.	Deaf & dumb, blind, insane, and idiots.	In prisons, and paupers.
Maine	500,438	1,355	222	180	537	13	10	94	117	
New Hampshire	284,036	538	181	153	486	9	3	19	31	
Massachusetts	729,030	8,669	283	308	1,071	17	22	200	239	
Rhode Island	105,587	3,243	74	63	203	3	1	13	17	
Connecticut	301,136	8,159	309	143	498	8	13	44	65	
Vermont	291,218	730	135	101	398	2	2	13	17	
New York	2,378,890	50,031	1,039	875	2,146	68	91	194	353	
New Jersey	351,588	21,718	164	126	369	15	26	73	114	
Pennsylvania	1,676,115	47,918	781	540	1,946	51	96	187	334	
Ohio	1,502,122	17,345	559	372	1,195	33	33	165	231	
Indiana	678,698	7,168	297	135	487	15	19	75	109	
Illinois	472,354	3,929	155	86	213	24	10	79	113	
Michigan	211,560	707	31	25	39	2	4	26	32	
Wisconsin	30,749	196	5	9	8			3	3	
Iowa	42,924	188	10	3	7	4	3	4	11	
	9,557,055	171,892	4,233	3,219	9,599	262	333	1,191	1,786	24,566
Delaware	58,561	19,524	45	15	52	8	18	28	54	
Maryland	317,717	151,515	178	165	387	68	101	149	318	
Virginia	740,968	498,829	443	426	1,052	150	466	381	997	
North Carolina	454,870	268,549	280	223	580	74	167	221	462	
South Carolina	259,084	335,314	140	133	376	78	156	137	371	
Georgia	407,695	223,697	193	136	294	64	151	134	349	
Alabama	335,185	255,571	173	113	232	53	96	125	274	
Mississippi	179,074	196,577	64	43	116	28	69	82	179	
Louisiana	155,457	193,954	42	37	55	17	36	45	98	
Tennessee	640,627	188,583	291	255	699	67	99	162	328	
Kentucky	590,253	189,575	400	236	795	77	141	180	398	
Missouri	323,888	59,814	126	82	202	27	42	68	137	
Arkansas	77,174	20,400	40	26	45	2	8	21	31	
Florida	27,943	26,534	14	9	10	2	10	12	24	
District of Columbia	30,657	13,155	8	6	14	4	9	7	20	
	4,632,053	2,701,566	2,449	1,805	4,909	715	1,559	1,734	4,020	13,507
	14,189,108	2,873,458	6,682	5,024	14,508	977	1,892	2,926	5,806	

Table No. 2.—Showing the Annual Products of each State, according to Census of 1840.

STATES AND TERRITORIES.	VALUE OF ANNUAL PRODUCTS FROM						
	Agriculture.	Manufactures.	Commerce.	Mining.	Forest.	Fisheries.	Total.
	<i>Dollars.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>	<i>Dollars.</i>
Maine - - -	15,856,270	5,615,303	1,505,380	327,376	1,877,663	1,280,713	26,462,705
New Hampshire -	11,377,752	6,545,811	1,001,533	88,373	449,861	92,811	19,556,141
Vermont - - -	17,879,155	5,685,425	758,899	389,488	430,224	-	25,143,191
Massachusetts -	16,065,627	43,518,057	7,004,691	2,020,572	377,354	0,483,996	75,470,297
Rhode Island -	2,199,309	8,640,626	1,294,956	162,410	44,610	659,312	13,001,223
Connecticut -	11,371,776	12,778,963	1,963,281	820,419	181,575	907,723	28,023,737
New England S.	74,749,889	82,784,185	13,528,740	3,808,638	3,361,287	9,424,555	187,657,294
New York - - -	108,275,281	47,454,514	24,311,715	7,408,070	5,040,781	1,316,072	193,806,433
New Jersey - -	16,209,853	10,696,257	1,206,929	1,073,921	361,326	124,140	29,672,426
Pennsylvania -	68,180,924	33,354,279	10,593,368	17,666,146	1,203,578	35,360	131,033,655
Delaware - - -	3,198,440	1,538,879	266,257	54,555	13,119	181,285	5,252,535
Maryland - - -	17,586,720	6,212,677	3,499,087	1,056,210	241,194	225,773	28,821,661
Dist. of Columbia	176,942	904,526	802,725	-	-	87,400	1,971,593
Middle States	213,628,160	100,161,132	40,680,081	27,258,902	6,859,998	1,970,030	390,558,303
Virginia - - -	59,085,821	8,349,218	5,299,451	3,321,629	617,760	95,173	76,769,053
North Carolina -	26,975,831	2,053,697	1,322,284	372,486	1,446,108	251,792	32,422,198
South Carolina -	21,553,691	2,248,915	2,632,421	187,608	549,626	1,275	27,173,536
Georgia - - -	31,468,271	1,953,950	2,248,488	191,631	117,439	584	35,980,363
Florida - - -	1,834,237	434,544	464,637	2,700	27,350	213,219	2,976,687
Southern States	140,917,851	15,040,324	11,967,281	4,076,054	2,758,283	562,043	175,321,836
Alabama - - -	24,696,513	1,732,770	2,273,267	81,310	177,465	-	28,961,325
Mississippi - -	26,494,565	1,585,790	1,453,686	-	205,297	-	29,739,338
Louisiana - - -	22,851,375	4,067,655	7,868,898	165,220	71,751	-	35,044,959
Arkansas - - -	5,086,757	1,145,309	420,635	18,225	217,469	-	6,888,395
Tennessee - -	31,660,180	2,477,193	2,239,478	1,371,331	225,179	-	37,973,360
Southwestern S.	110,789,390	11,028,717	14,255,964	1,636,146	897,161	-	138,607,378
Missouri - - -	10,484,263	2,360,708	2,349,245	187,669	448,559	-	15,830,444
Kentucky - - -	29,226,545	5,092,353	2,580,575	1,539,919	184,799	-	38,524,191
Ohio - - -	37,802,001	14,588,091	8,050,316	2,442,682	1,013,063	10,525	63,906,678
Indiana - - -	17,247,743	3,676,705	1,866,155	660,336	80,000	1,192	23,532,631
Illinois - - -	13,701,466	3,243,981	1,493,425	293,272	249,841	-	18,981,985
Michigan - - -	4,592,889	1,376,249	622,822	56,790	467,540	-	7,026,390
Wisconsin - - -	568,105	304,692	189,957	384,603	430,580	27,663	1,905,600
Iowa - - -	769,295	179,087	136,525	13,250	83,949	-	1,132,106
Northwestern S.	114,302,307	30,821,866	17,289,020	5,579,011	2,958,331	39,380	170,989,925
Total - - -	654,387,597	239,836,224	79,721,086	42,358,761	16,835,060	11,996,008	1,063,134,736

Table No. 3—showing the number of Persons engaged in Mining, Agriculture, Commerce, Manufactures, Navigating the Ocean, and Internal Navigation.

States and Territories.	Mining.	Agriculture.	Commerce.	Manufac- tures.	Navigating the Ocean.	Internal Navigation.
Maine - - -	36	101,630	2,921	21,879	10,091	539
New Hampshire - - -	13	77,949	1,379	17,826	452	198
Vermont - - -	77	73,150	1,303	13,174	41	146
Massachusetts - - -	499	87,837	8,063	85,176	27,153	372
Rhode Island - - -	35	16,617	1,348	21,271	1,717	228
Connecticut - - -	151	56,955	2,743	27,932	2,700	431
New England States	811	414,138	17,757	187,258	42,154	1,914
New York - - -	1,898	455,954	28,468	173,193	5,511	10,167
New Jersey - - -	266	56,701	2,233	27,004	1,143	1,625
Pennsylvania - - -	4,503	207,533	15,338	105,933	1,815	3,951
Delaware - - -	5	16,015	467	4,060	401	235
Maryland - - -	320	72,046	3,281	21,529	717	1,528
District of Columbia -		384	240	2,278	126	80
Middle States	7,092	808,633	50,077	333,947	9,713	17,586
Virginia - - -	1,995	318,771	6,361	54,147	582	2,952
North Carolina - - -	589	217,095	1,734	14,322	327	379
South Carolina - - -	51	198,363	1,958	10,325	381	348
Georgia - - -	574	209,383	2,428	7,984	262	352
Florida - - -	1	12,117	481	1,177	435	118
Southern States	3,210	955,729	12,962	87,955	1,987	4,149
Alabama - - -	96	177,439	2,212	7,195	256	758
Mississippi - - -	14	139,724	1,303	4,151	33	100
Louisiana - - -	1	79,289	8,549	7,565	1,322	662
Arkansas - - -	41	26,355	215	1,173	3	39
Tennessee - - -	103	227,739	2,217	17,815	55	302
Southwestern States	255	650,546	14,496	37,899	1,669	1,861
Missouri - - -	742	92,408	2,522	11,100	39	1,885
Kentucky - - -	331	197,738	3,448	23,217	44	968
Ohio - - -	754	272,579	9,201	66,265	212	3,323
Indiana - - -	233	148,806	3,076	20,590	89	627
Illinois - - -	782	105,337	2,506	13,185	63	310
Michigan - - -	40	56,521	728	6,890	24	166
Wisconsin, - - -	794	7,047	479	1,814	14	209
Iowa - - -	217	10,469	355	1,629	13	78
Northwestern States	3,843	890,905	22,315	144,690	498	7,566
Total - - -	15,211	3,719,951	117,607	791,749	56,021	33,076

States and Territories.	Imports into each State.	American vessels entered each State.	Foreign vessels entered each State.	American vessels cleared from each State.	Foreign vessels cleared from each State.	Vessels built in each State.	Tonnage owned in each State.	American crews cleared from each State.	American crews entered each State.	Domestic produce exported from each State.	Foreign produce exported from each State.	Total of domestic and foreign produce exported from each State.
							<i>Tons. 95ths.</i>					
Maine	\$982,724	351	926	459	921	145	282,296.40	3,358	2,581	\$878,434	\$17,051	\$895,485
New Hampshire	51,407	21	10	18	10	7	29,224.07	159	230	74,914	7,036	81,944
Vermont	413,513	186		185			4,232.37	1,275	1,268	193,886		193,886
Massachusetts	19,385,223	1,222	606	980	612	146	506,374.21	9,247	12,780	5,526,455	3,749,630	9,276,085
Rhode Island	612,057	137	6	125	3	9	44,573.16	1,180	1,303	175,808	9,426	185,234
Connecticut	446,191	129		136	9	35	82,914.34	1,746	1,596	583,226		583,226
New York	99,882,438	4,006	1,805	3,604	1,728	106	468,410.58	29,612	32,810	23,296,995	9,971,104	33,268,099
New Jersey	4,182	9	1	19	2	72	62,740.87	184	58	76,434	19,645	96,079
Pennsylvania	15,050,715	453	78	333	72	49	112,359.17	3,169	4,518	4,148,211	1,151,204	5,299,415
Delaware						16	19,303.19			8,680		8,680
Maryland	6,995,285	339	90	311	89	129	116,204.00	2,491	2,648	4,313,189	263,372	4,576,561
District of Columbia	132,511	23	11	46	11	14	23,142.26	341	243	497,965	5,752	503,717
Virginia	913,462	87	37	192	50	10	51,886.39	1,813	674	5,183,424	3,772	5,187,196
North Carolina	229,233	153	30	344	37	25	40,901.11	2,205	984	426,934	992	427,926
South Carolina	3,086,077	146	94	212	102	4	33,414.21	2,263	1,318	10,318,822	66,604	10,385,426
Georgia	413,987	55	50	111	50	7	20,992.83	1,243	450	5,970,443		5,970,443
Alabama	895,201	128	45	200	44		21,742.00	2,077	1,053	10,338,159		10,338,159
Mississippi												
Louisiana	12,064,942	603	219	684	208	11	109,076.36	7,565	5,813	30,995,936	2,185,231	33,181,167
Ohio	19,280	64	34	76	36	44	23,925.55	208	200	95,854		95,854
Kentucky	10,480					11	8,125.87			3,723		3,723
Tennessee	146					3	4,240.94					
Michigan	176,221	43	39	78	34	7	10,999.29	156	96	133,305		133,305
Florida	279,393	180	14	199	18	3	9,672.68	1,055	913	291,094	43,712	334,806
Missouri	46,964					5	9,735.00					
Indiana												
Illinois												
Arkansas												
Wisconsin Territory												
Iowa Territory												
Total	143,874,252	8,336	4,105	8,312	4,036	858	2,096,478.81	71,352	71,536	103,533,891	17,494,525	121,028,416

Table No. 5, for the Year 1839, from Treasury Report of 1840.

	Where exported to.	Domestic exports.	American vessels cleared.	American vessels entered.	Foreign exports.	Total foreign and domestic exports.	Imports.	Excess of exports over imports.
1	Russia - - - -	\$434,587	29	49	\$304,659	\$1,239,246	\$2,393,894	
2	Prussia - - - -	29,313	4	2	43,500	72,813	77,412	\$2,401
3	Sweden and Norway - - -	337,000	3	34	26,502	363,502	1,553,684	
4	Swedish West Indies - - -	103,282	22	6	4,130	107,412	12,458	94,950
5	Denmark - - - -	50,634	3	1	38,177	88,811	80,997	7,814
6	Danish West Indies - - -	1,014,381	215	155	303,154	1,317,535	1,465,761	
7	Hanse Towns and ports of Germany	2,067,608	17	39	733,459	2,801,067	4,489,150	
8	Holland - - - -	1,677,352	40	54	295,651	1,973,003	2,149,732	
9	Dutch East Indies - - -	86,619	24	12	396,934	483,553	692,196	
10	Dutch West Indies - - -	282,042	26	67	70,975	353,017	582,284	
11	Dutch Guiana - - - -	58,863	36	35	2,003	61,666	49,008	12,658
12	Belgium - - - -	541,641	8	17	66,269	607,910	465,701	142,209
13	England - - - -	54,615,327	539	578	3,953,108	58,568,435	64,863,716	
14	Scotland - - - -	1,025,832	8	15	1,256	1,027,088	950,183	76,905
15	Ireland - - - -	380,719	4	4		330,719	150,689	180,030
16	Gibraltar - - - -	902,247	66	9	148,387	1,050,634	99,178	951,456
17	Malta - - - -	65,870	9	5	34,126	99,996	24,943	75,053
18	Mauritius - - - -	30,466	3	1	1,500	31,966		31,966
19	Cape of Good Hope - - -	88,379	7	4	5,020	93,399	43,059	50,340
20	British East Indies - - -	246,845	20	25	337,597	584,442	2,135,152	
21	British West Indies - - -	2,472,833	501	285	90,642	2,563,475	941,699	1,621,776
22	British Guiana - - - -	34,906	31	7	218	35,124	14,215	20,909
23	British Honduras - - -	181,861	41	22	29,339	211,200	164,027	47,173
24	British North American Colonies	3,418,770	3,313	3,361	144,684	3,563,454	2,155,146	1,408,308
25	Australia - - - -	6,790	3	2		6,790	58,344	
26	Other British Colonies - - -				2,360	2,360		2,360
27	France on the Atlantic - - -	14,919,848	207	186	2,088,655	17,008,503	30,918,450	
28	France on the Mediterranean - - -	1,046,260	37	26	176,186	1,222,446	1,612,871	
29	French West Indies - - -	585,916	186	155	105,905	691,821	702,798	
30	French Guiana - - - -	1,643	17	21		1,643		1,643
31	Spain on the Atlantic - - -	316,144	58	23	82,014	348,158	263,193	84,965
32	Spain on the Mediterranean - - -	209,724	31	85	19,000	228,724	1,597,978	
33	Teneriffe and other Canaries - - -	15,572	8	19	11,939	27,511	196,755	
34	Manilla and Philippine Islands - - -	99,553	4	22	38,255	136,808	876,477	
35	Cuba - - - -	5,025,626	1,240	1,247	1,091,205	6,116,831	12,599,843	

36	Porto Rico	-	-	779,049	153	411	87,343	866,397	3,742,745	
37	Portugal	-	-	59,711	17	48	6,093	65,804	687,778	
38	Madeira	-	-	64,082	24	11	15,045	79,123	539,800	
39	Fayal and other Azores	-	-	9,130	5	2	8,415	13,869	15,222	
40	Cape de Verd Islands	-	-	77,138	16	2	4,739	85,553	39,523	46,030
41	Italy	-	-	315,399	9	17	122,753	438,152	1,182,297	
42	Sicily	-	-	192,462	9	62	84,607	277,069	592,951	
43	Sardinia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,348	
44	Trieste	-	-	429,578	11	18	162,671	592,249	477,539	114,710
45	Turkey, Levant, &c.	-	-	83,320	12	17	266,054	349,374	629,190	
46	Morocco and Barbary States	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	96,493	
47	Hayti	-	-	991,265	159	174	131,294	1,122,599	1,377,989	
48	Texas	-	-	1,379,065	339	269	308,017	1,687,082	318,116	1,368,966
49	Mexico	-	-	816,660	142	143	1,970,702	2,787,362	3,127,153	
50	Central Republic of America	-	-	111,752	4	6	104,490	216,242	192,845	23,397
51	New Grenada	-	-	35,219	8	14	29,585	64,804	90,514	
52	Venezuela	-	-	413,245	66	110	272,736	685,981	1,982,702	
53	Brazil	-	-	2,133,997	179	158	503,488	2,637,485	5,292,955	
54	Cisplatine Republic	-	-	50,998	37	30	38,302	89,300	625,432	
55	Argentine Republic	-	-	223,593	3	3	142,470	376,063	521,114	
56	Chili	-	-	1,307,143	22	13	487,410	1,794,553	1,186,641	607,912
57	Peru	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	242,813	
58	South America generally	-	-	23,618	-	7	27,257	50,875	-	50,875
59	China	-	-	430,464	15	18	1,103,137	1,533,601	3,678,509	
60	Europe generally	-	-	128,105	2	-	-	128,105	-	128,105
61	Asia generally	-	-	158,321	13	7	400,431	558,752	63,525	495,227
62	Africa generally	-	-	443,218	31	32	47,061	490,279	419,054	71,225
63	West Indies generally	-	-	457,968	134	2	33,060	491,028	-	491,028
64	South Seas	-	-	85,938	127	179	39,750	125,688	318,143	
65	Atlantic Ocean	-	-	-	1	8	-	-	-	
66	Uncertain places	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	
				103,533,891	8,312	8,336	17,494,525	121,028,416	162,092,132	

[From the Treasury Report of 1840.]

No. 6.—EXPORTS OF OUR DOMESTIC PRODUCTS TO TEXAS IN 1839.

1. *Products of the Fisheries.*

Dried or smoked and pickled fish	\$3,137
Spermaceti oil and candles, whale and other fish oil	7,057
Non-enumerated	33,232
Total exports products of the fisheries	43,426

2. *Products of the Forest.*

Staves, heading, shingles, boards, plank, and scantling	48,504
Other lumber	22,267
Oak bark, and other dyo	599
All manufactures of wood	51,112
Tar, pitch, rosin and turpentine	1,471
Ashes—pot and pearl	64
Skins and furs	225
Non-enumerated	33,232
Total exports products of the forest	157,474

3. *Products of Agriculture.*

Beef	3,587
Pork, ham, bacon and lard	62,132
Butter and cheese	13,028
Horses	700
Flour	55,091
Indian corn	15,981
Indian meal	1,151
Rye, oats, and other small grain, and pulse	6,902
Biscuit, or ship bread	12,701
Potatoes	5,145
Apples	1,040
Rice	5,743
Tobacco	1,509
Brown sugar	27,990
Molasses	3,250
Non-enumerated	33,234
Total exports products of agriculture	239,092

4. *Exports of Domestic Manufactures.*

Household furniture	58,571
Coaches and other carriages	11,410

Hats	\$19,055
Saddlery	14,063
Beer, porter, cider and spirits, from grain	50,508
Leather boots and shoes	64,308
Tallow candles and soap	6,676
Snuff and manufactured tobacco	17,855
Linseed oil and spirits of turpentine	1,539
Cables and cordage	4,262
Lead	1,104
Bar iron and nails	14,441
Castings	11,540
All manufactures of iron, or of iron and steel	89,261
Spirits from molasses	9,848
Refined sugar	8,844
Chocolate	19
Gunpowder	4,639
Copper, brass, and copper manufactured	335
Medical drugs	7,930
Printed and coloured piece goods of cotton	95,856
White piece goods of cotton	138,603
Yarn and other threads	28
All other manufactures of cotton	11,166
Bags, and other manufactures of flax	20
Wearing apparel	118,302
Combs and buttons	1,470
Brushes	1,025
Billiard tables and apparatus	413
Umbrellas and parasols	485
Printing presses and type	1,756
Musical instruments	950
Books and maps	3,061
Paper and other stationary	25,032
Paints and varnish	8,663
Vinegar	1,051
Earthen and stone ware	6,541
Glass	6,875
Tin	4,775
Powder and lead	100
Marble and stone	966
Gold, silver, and gold leaf	150
Artificial flowers and jewelry	1,571
Bricks and lime	2,796
Domestic salt	664
Manufactured articles not enumerated	100,056
Total exports of domestic manufactures	929,071